DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 471 SP 023 244

AUTHOR Sharp, Bert L., Ed.
TITLE Dean's Grant Projects: Challenge and Change in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. National Support Systems Project.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
GRANT OEG007902045
NOTE 231p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; Administrator Attitudes; Change Strategies; Curriculum Development; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Mainstreaming; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Deans Grant Project; Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) provided both the financial impetus for adapting teacher education programs to meet the challenges of mainstreaming handicapped students into regular classrooms and the arena for the discussion of different approaches to the institution of necessary changes. This book presents 13 papers written by educators experienced in the issues and problems of implementing DGPs. Paper 1 describes the origins of the DGPs and their present operation from the federal perspective. Results of a survey of DGP officers are summarized in paper 2. Paper 3 offers an overview of functions and possible activities of DGPs. In paper 4, the process of faculty development in the revision of teacher education programs is detailed. The problem of revising teacher education curricula is discussed in paper 5. Descriptions of how curricula in elementary and secondary education can be changed are presented in papers 6 and 7. The work of projects in the areas of administration and school counselors and psychologists is the topic of paper 8. Following paper 9's discussion of different institutional approaches to project activities, a description is given in paper 10 of DGPs in supporting regional consortia. Paper 11 discusses the problems of program evaluation. Issues that may determine the future course of teacher education and educational services for handicapped students are considered in paper 12. A compendium of materials produced by various DGPs and information on where they can be obtained is presented in the final paper. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237471

Dean's Grant Projects:

Challenge and Change in Teacher Education

Editor

Bert L. Sharp

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Pomeroy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A publication of the National Support Systems Project at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, under a grant from the Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education.

SP 023 244

This project was performed pursuant to Grant No. OEG007902045 from Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U. S. Department of Education. The points of view expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

1982

This book was developed and published by the National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. Copies may be ordered from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

The Dean's Grant Initiative: Fostering an Agenda of Shared Responsibility in Teacher Education.....George Hagerty, Thomas Behrens, & Marty Abramson.....11

Dean's Grant Projects: Progress and Prospects.....Maynard C. Reynolds.....26

Reconceptualizing and Restructuring an Undergraduate Teacher-Education Program.....Robert L. Saunders & Barbara G. Burch.....45

Dean's Grant Projects: A Vehicle for Faculty Development..... Bob G. Woods.....60

Public Law 94-142 as an Organizing Principle for Teacher Education Curricula.....K. Charles Lakin & M. C. Reynolds 74

Elementary Education: Curriculum and Programs for Teacher Education.....Fay B. Haisley.....86

Secondary Education: Curriculum and Programs for Teacher Education.....Dale Scannell.....107

Key Support Personnel: Administrators, Counselors, Psychologists .....Bert L. Sharp.....117

Alternative Approaches to Dean's Grant Projects.....Elizabeth H. Sakiey.....131

The Experiences of Dean's Grant Consortia.....Bert L. Sharp 143

Processes of Evaluation and Documentation.....Percy Bates 159

Facing the Future in Dean's Grant Projects.....Maynard C. Reynolds.....194

The Development of Materials and Resources for Dean's Grant Projects.....Karen M. Lundholm.....206

Introduction

WHEN the U. S. Congress in 1957 empowered the U. S. Office of Education (USOE) to develop programs to improve the educational opportunities of children classified as mentally retarded, a new era began in the history of American education. Previously, the USOE had been primarily a center for the collection and dissemination of information and statistics; with its new authorization, the USOE expanded its personnel and activities to carry out the intent of Congress; thus it sought out programs that were pursuing new directions in teacher training and research, and in the development of materials and delivery systems in order to stimulate innovation and change. During the 1960s and 1970s programs were extended to include children with all varieties of handicaps and children manifesting other school-related problems.

In 1982, we take notice of the completion of seven years of growth and development in teacher education and the Dean's Grant program. This program was established by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) in 1974 to support changes in the preservice preparation of regular classroom teachers to enable them to serve handicapped students in the mainstream of American education.

Although Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act was signed in 1975, most handicapped students already had been assured access to a free and appropriate education. In 1972, the case of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (PARC) vs. Pennsylvania established the right to education, education that was appropriate to the handicapped pupil, placement in the least restrictive environment, and parental right to participate in educational planning for their children. Discussions on how handicapped pupils could be integrated in regular classroom programs had been underway even earlier (see Reynolds, 1962). Deno (1972) described new ways of deploying special educators in mainstream settings and Birch (1974) examined alternative programs for educating handicapped children, and especially those who were classified as EMR (Educable Mentally Retarded), in regular classrooms.

The initiation of the Dean's Grant program in 1974, however, and the subsequent funding of over 260 projects between 1975 and 1982, for the first time reached into colleges, schools, and departments of education to stimulate revisions in teacher-education programs to make them responsive to the accumulating devel-

opments. Clearly, including handicapped pupils in regular classrooms and schools requires changes in how teachers function in those classrooms and how schools are operated. The Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) provided both the financial impetus for adapting teacher-preparation programs to these changes and the arena for the discussion of different approaches to the institution of necessary changes.

The objective of preparing classroom teachers fully and adequately to serve all children, including those with handicaps and/or special learning and instructional needs, in regular schools has not been achieved in all instances, yet significant improvements have been documented in faculty development (i.e., increasing the skills, knowledge, and commitments of individual faculty members) and curriculum revisions. Nor have all improvements occurred at the same rate or according to the same methods, a not unexpected finding given the differences among institutions offering teacher-education programs. Nevertheless, a great deal has been learned from the different projects.

The purpose of this book is to make available what has been learned from past DGPs to the deans and other personnel of teacher-education institutions who are taking early measures to update their teacher-education programs. The chapters, therefore, range from general overviews of the Dean's Grant program and Dean's Grant Projects to examinations of what approaches work under what conditions in different institutions and the identification of trends that may affect the future of teacher education.

The Problems and the Challenge

TEACHER education has been suffering from a severe case of distrust. Whether this negative attitude is deserved can be argued but it cannot be denied that in this country there has been a general lack of confidence, not only in the training of teachers but, also, in the public schools. The public and even many educators have openly criticized or at least raised questions about American public education and its teacher-preparation system.

During the 1960s and 1970s, school administrators in a number of states expressed the opinion that they could do a better job of training teachers than could the teacher-preparation institutions. Alarming numbers of classroom teachers and their organizational leaders vented their dissatisfaction with the quality of the training they had received, and they asserted that classroom teachers, not college or university personnel, should control the preparation of teachers to work in classrooms. Indeed, in a number of states legislation was proposed to provide "quick fixes" for teacher education through legislative mandates of various kinds which often included the shrinking or abolition of teacher-education colleges and departments. In at least 18 states, examinations conducted by the state rather than graduation from institutional programs have come to be considered the better guarantors for quality teachers. By the time the legislation that became Public Law 94-142 was under consideration, teacher education was under attack along a broad front.

The major premise of the Dean's Grant program is that deans of education have the authority and power to lead faculties in changing teacher-education programs. This premise raised serious questions: Did deans of education have such power? Would deans be willing to commit their time and prestige to the task? Would members of teacher-education faculties accept the leadership of deans in the revision of programs? Such questions have been answered in the affirmative by empirical investigations as well as personal experience. For example, Okun (1982) and Sivage (1982)

investigated two related questions: Did deans of education perceive themselves and were they perceived by their faculties as possessing the power to institute changes through Dean's Grant programs (Okun)? What are the methods used by deans to make Dean's Grant Projects instruments of change (Sivage)? In both studies, the investigators found that deans are perceived as possessing the power and authority to institute change in teacher-education programs if they officially identify their office with the work of Dean's Grant Projects and personally lead and support project activities.

In the analysis of her results, Sivage described the advocacy role adopted by deans to insure the success of projects as follows:

> The site visits revealed that some deans must negotiate with competing environmental factions, both internally and externally. Deans who persuaded faculty members to become involved in DGP activities used person and "power of the office" persuasion, and even allowed colleagues to persuade in their names. Finally, some deans successfully choreographed change, teaching, directing, and overseeing casts of characters according to their particular situations. These roles of Negotiator, Persuader, and Choreographer of Change are described in the literature that was reviewed and are supported by the data collected. Although, clearly, the roles do not comprise all the various activities that are undertaken by deans, they are sufficient for this discussion because they are the roles deans play as project directors of Deans' Grants. Thus they form one dimension of an operational definition of advocacy. (Sivage, 1982, p. 55)

On the basis of the interviews she conducted with deans and faculty members, Okun (1982) concluded that "it is not faculty submissiveness to the will of the dean that makes the concept [of the Dean's Grant program] sound but, rather, the sense of following a proven leader in ascertaining and achieving institutional goals" (p. 157).

> This distinction is particularly important in institutions of higher education where, as these data confirm, deans seldom have the power to dictate programs. Curricula in colleges and universities are largely the province of the faculty...and, as one dean pointed out, there is very little that a dean can do "to prevent individual faculty from 'doing their own thing'." Rather, deans are in the position to create the environment for change, using their influence and broad communications network. For example, they can supersede departmental territorialities which might preclude faculty members from becoming involved in activities that are generally considered the province of one unit (e.g., Special Education). They also can spread the message faster than other faculty members that the goals of the project are important to the entire school....Finally, in many states, deans of schools of education are regarded as leaders in the field of public education; their expertise

> is sought and their ideas and suggestions carry significant weight with educational policy makers and educators in the field, as well as with other deans.... (p. 157)

Okun pointed out that the situational context is always a factor in change processes just as are the personalities of the deans. She concluded that the power of the deanship in an institutional context and the strength of a dean may feed off each other. Stronger deans are comfortable in using their abilities to influence change. Weaker deans are more comfortable in seeking positions in which the structure and climate of the institutions discourage change.

The decision of the leaders in the BEH in 1974 to establish the Dean's Grant program was a gamble that the deans could and would seize the opportunity to change teacher education to prepare better classroom teachers and to strengthen their institutions. In general, this decision has proven to be correct.

Issues Facing Teacher Educators

THE lessons learned by the educators who are engaged in Dean's Grant programs have not come easily. There have been long and hard debates on a number of issues. Who is a competent teacher? What must a teacher know and be able to do in order to teach in a mainstream classroom that includes one or more handicapped children? Is there an adequate knowledge base for making major changes in teacher education? What is the state of the art in training teachers? Who should conduct the training? What is the role of special education? Must we restructure teacher education and renegotiate the roles of teacher educators? The institutions to which Deans' Grants were awarded varied in type, location, and size of student enrollment. For example, in a study of project demographies and outcomes, Gazvoda (1980) found that most grants were awarded to public, urban institutions with student populations of from 10,000 to more than 30,000. However, 9% of the institutions were private sectarian and 10% were private nonsectarian; 40.6% of the institutions were located in suburban or rural settings; and 23.4% had student bodies of 5,000 and under whereas an additional 25.2% had student bodies of 5,000 to 10,000.

Given that the grants are awarded to deans, to whom should the deans give the responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the programs outlined in the grant proposals? The management of many early projects was assigned to special education because the people there were knowledgeable about handicapped children. In such cases, most deans quickly realized that the assignment had been inappropriate and they shifted the responsibility to regular education personnel. The reason for the shift was not incompetence (many special education faculty members developed very good programs) but institutional politics, territorial imperatives, and faculty governance. In most teacher-education institutions, each program is an independent clearly demarcated entity. Thus faculty members tended to view activities and problems pertaining to the teaching and training of teachers to work with handicapped students as the sole domain of the special education faculty. A project that was managed by a special educator was regarded as another activity within the purview of special education and regular educators saw little reason to be interested in it.

When the project management was shifted to regular education, however, and especially to one or more persons in elementary education, curriculum, or instruction, the interest of other faculty members in these departments was aroused and they began to participate in the project activities and to begin the process

of faculty development. Nevertheless, the implications of students' needs for changes in structure, courses, course content, and/or knowledge bases, and the suggestion that faculty members needed new skills caused many members to become defensive. They did not want the content of their courses or their teaching assignments to be altered, especially not without their participation. Questions about violations of and threats to academic freedom were raised and debated at faculty meetings, faculty retreats, and social gatherings.

Much of the energy of deans and project directors, consequently, was devoted to broadening the base of faculty participation in project activities and calling upon influential individuals to acquaint faculty members with the new policies reflected in federal and state legislation and adjudications. Faculty members in regular education program areas were provided with opportunities to gain "on-hands" experience with handicapped pupils and their parents in schools and classrooms under both segregated and mainstreamed situations. From these and related activities, faculty members increasingly accepted the responsibility for preparing teachers who could serve handicapped children in mainstream classrooms. Many individuals recognized their experiences as the opportunity to do something about their concerns for individual children and interests in individualized education, not only for handicapped students but, also, children with a diversity of special needs--in fact, all children. New relations among faculty members were established across disciplines (e.g., regular education and special education) and new responsibilities were accepted within regular education. Hence the subject for debates shifted to the content and experiences provided in the teacher-education curriculum.

What do teachers need to know and do? Early attempts to revise curricula centered on adding a new course on exceptional child education or integrating into existing courses some modules on exceptional children. In the seven years that the Dean's Grant program has been functioning, a pattern has emerged: initially, programs did indeed add a course or two, then they integrated new content into old courses, and now they have turned to extending teacher-education programs. An important initial activity for many projects in the early days was the development of lists of competencies which ranged from a dozen or so to hundreds and even thousands of items. Obviously, there was considerable latitude in the ideas of what classroom teachers were expected to know and be able to do. The different suppositions of what schools and schooling should be like and how teachers should perform their roles both frustrated and challenged teacher educators. With the aid of DGP staff members, therefore, faculty members began to look for resources and experiences that would help to provide answers.

Starting in 1975, the NSSP organized an annual meeting of DGP deans and directors to share experiences and problems and to open communications among the personnel of different projects. These annual meetings, and the regional meetings which were initiated somewhat later, became critical supports for the people who were engaged in changing teacher-education programs. The processes of identifying and holding on to what was good and what works in teacher education and what should be changed to make teacher education more responsive to the needs of elementary and secondary school special needs children under present conditions and for the future were major DGP concerns. Out of these concerns there came some ideas for a professional curriculum for teachers, A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education (Reynolds, Birch, Grohs, et al., 1980). The so-called "common body of practices" comprised 10 clusters of capability for teachers. (For the list of instruc-

tional materials that have been developed on the basis of these clusters see the paper by Lakin and Reynolds in this volume.)

A more recent issue among DGP personnel has been the time needed to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills. How much "life space" must be taken to adequately prepare a teacher--one that can work with a group of students who have diverse educational needs? How much time can be afforded for professional teacher education in the total education of the teacher? How much time can the student afford? Some institutions (many with Deans' Grants) indicate that a five- or even six-year program may be required to train students to become professional teachers. The belief is growing that programs consisting of three or four professional courses, usually, a foundations course, a curriculum course, a methods course, and student teaching do not provide the time and opportunity for faculty members to adequately prepare teachers for today's classrooms. In contrast, some believe that extending the length of programs may drastically reduce their cost effectiveness for students, considering the low starting salaries, or may become a barrier for low-income and minority persons who cannot afford the longer preparation time, or may force some institutions out of teacher education if the student population were to fall precipitously. These issues have not been fully resolved but some state legislatures and professional organizations (AACTE and NEA) are exploring their possibilities. In some states, currently, a full year's internship is required for certification.

One thing is apparent: If the professional practitioners and faculties of higher education do not reach some definitive position, the governmental agencies (e.g., legislatures and governing boards) will move to provide their own solutions to the problem of adequate teacher training. Such solutions might satisfy the agencies but they would not necessarily be the best options for the professions or for children.

These topics have generated considerable discussion at NSSP and AACTE meetings and on the campuses of many institutions. For example, the University of Kansas and the University of Florida teacher-education faculties have taken steps to extend their programs beyond four years. A number of other institutions are at various stages of studying the issue in terms of what is required to become an adequately prepared teacher and how long it will take to do the job.

A Support System: Technical Assistance

In 1968, the passage of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) in the USOE Bureau of Educational Professions led to the generation of a number of innovative programs in education. Within the framework of these programs there was created what was called the Leadership Training Institutes (Davies, 1975). The center for technical assistance in special education became the Leadership Training Institute/Special Education (LTI/SE) at the University of Minnesota, under the leadership of Maynard Reynolds. Subsequently, this LTI became the NSSP, the technical assistance center for Dean's Grant Projects. NSSP has been a key ingredient in the success of Dean's Grant Projects during their first seven years, 1975-1982. A remarkable lesson can be learned from a review of the conditions that led to the development of technical assistance and/or support systems by the USOE and from the experiences of persons who were engaged in conceptualizing and operating these centers.

In brief, it became apparent very early that the USOE could not staff its national and regional offices with sufficient per-

sonnel to manage and conduct technical assistance services for all the projects. More important, perhaps, the agency's role of administering, monitoring, and evaluating projects for funding purposes was not compatible with the advocacy that characterizes technical assistance. When Reynolds summarized the proceedings of the conference on national technical assistance support systems in special education which was held in 1974 (see Reynolds, 1975), he presented a concept of a technical assistance/support system (he used the terms interchangeably) that became the model for serving the Dean's Grant Projects. He believed that such a system functioned best outside the government; most agencies had limited staff and resources, were burdened by administrative duties, and could not act as monitors and advocates simultaneously. Support systems should operate on a "soft" basis, that is, they should be temporary structures with limited existence. Temporary structures would not compete with existing professional organizations but, rather, would strengthen them.

Reynolds recognized the legitimacy of at least two programs: (a) the federal agency's need to comply with the legislative mandate in administering a program and (b) the needs of the agency's constituents who are served through the program. Thus, a support system must be able to assist both agency and constituents without violating the trust of either. Personalized and responsive assistance is extremely reinforcing.

A support system can provide a variety of services: consultation; training; dissemination of information; advocacy; and the like. In general, a small central staff that is augmented by a range of experts who can be called upon for specific tasks for short periods of time can provide more services than any large permanent staff.

These briefly stated views became the philosophy or framework for the development and operations of the NSSP. In fact, the major characteristics of NSSP have been (a) its temporary nature (established in 1975, it ceased to exist on September 30, 1982), (b) its functions as an advocacy system for projects and their needs, (c) its cooperation with the federal agency to carry out the legislative mandate, (d) its small, sometimes part-time central office staff, (e) its attention to the programmatic concept and the future while dealing with specific current problems, (f) its organization of conferences, development and dissemination of materials, and facilitation of communication among projects, and (g) its advocacy for handicapped persons and the professions that serve them.

The NSSP program reflected the needs of both federal and local clients. The Advisory Board, which was created to work with and advise the NSSP staff on matters that affected both clients, was composed of five to eight regional liaisons, a handicapped person, and the parent of a handicapped person who also represented a federation of advocacy organizations.

The regional liaison officers were deans and Dean's Grant Project directors; all were committed to improving the quality of teacher preparation generally as well as in their own universities, and especially in programs related to providing services for handicapped pupils who are placed in mainstream classrooms. The deans who acted as liaisons were geographically dispersed around the country and came from small and large institutions, including the traditionally black colleges.

Two significant components of the NSSP program were the dissemination of materials produced by projects and those developed by NSSP, and the scheduling of both regional and annual national meetings. At the latter, new projects were acquainted with the

support services that were available and were welcomed into the network of DGP institutions. The programs afforded time for project personnel to share information on successes and introduce new ideas and concepts; failures; debate of issues; arrive at consensus on some materials; and arrange for the exchange of materials and experts.

Although the Dean's Grant program did not include as a major purpose the production of instructional and conceptual materials, the very nature of the work in which the projects were engaged, coupled with the creativity of the people involved, inevitably resulted in a rich literature on the revision of teacher education. Many materials that were useful to the projects and to educators in institutions without Deans' Grants would never have been accepted by commercial publishers because of the expense of production, the forms in which they were presented, and/or the limited market for them. The final chapter in this volume lists the many products developed during the first seven years of the program.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) has had a Dean's Grant to disseminate to institutions without grants the materials developed by Dean's Grant Projects, and to work through state AACTE organizations to encourage teacher educators to support the legislative mandates for educating handicapped students. Currently, AACTE has a project to assist small, private, liberal arts colleges to strengthen their teacher-training programs. AACTE also will continue to distribute materials and products initiated by NSSP. This organization and the ERIC Clearing House Project, located in Washington, DC, have become the central depositories for information and materials on teacher education and Dean's Grant Projects.

NSSP successfully accomplished its mission of a temporary structure that was designed to provide technical assistance to a large number of local projects; set goals that were responsive to its clients, the projects, and the federal agency; was issue- and future-oriented; and strengthened the institutions it served.

Organization of Book

IN one sense the chapters of this volume progress from the past to the future. In the first paper, Hagerty, Behrens (the first Project Officer for the program), and Abramson describe the origins of the Dean's Grant program and its present operations from the federal perspective. Reynolds, in the second chapter, summarizes the results of a survey of DGP officers which was conducted at the Spring 1982 national DGP meeting. It is fair to say, on the basis of these two chapters, that the Dean's Grant program has been strengthened over the seven years of its existence first by the support provided by the federal agencies and second by the acceptance of and dedication to the program by teacher educators; indeed, the best advocates for the program seem to be the teacher educators who are participating in projects.

Saunders and Birch offer an overview of the task of Dean's Grant Projects which takes the reader step-by-step through the functions and possible activities of a project. In the following chapter, Woods details the process of faculty development, the first major task in the revision of teacher-education programs.

Lakin and Reynolds discuss the problems of revising teacher-education curricula. The core of their discussion is the 10 clusters of capability, the common body of professional practice for teachers. They also list the materials that were developed

under the auspices of NSSP to provide teacher educators with suggestions for incorporating elements of the clusters in their courses. Haisley and Scannell, in their respective chapters, provide experiential bases for their descriptions of how curricula in elementary and secondary education can be changed.

Some Dean's Grant Projects have extended their areas of concern by focusing on other pre-service students than those in elementary and secondary education. The work of projects in the areas of administration and school counselors and psychologists is discussed by Sharp in the chapter on key support personnel. Following Sakiey's discussion of the different approaches to project activities which are generated by the particular needs of institutions, Sharp describes the experiences of Dean's Grant Projects in supporting regional consortia.

A major concern of projects, almost since their beginning, has been that of documenting their successes. Bates discusses the problems of evaluation and offers an example of a program that was conducted by Cleveland State University. The addenda to his chapter show the kinds of data which have been collected on a regional and two national evaluations and the conclusions that were drawn in each.

The next to last chapter by Reynolds is a slightly revised version of the paper with which he introduced the final NSSP-sponsored national meeting of DGPs (Spring 1982). It is reprinted here because of its attention to issues that may determine the future course of teacher education and educational services for handicapped children.

Last but no less important is the compendium of materials produced by the various DGP projects over the years and the information on where these products can be obtained. The author, Karen Lundholm, has been the Assistant to the Director of NSSP since the support system was established and probably has had more dealings with project personnel on a day-to-day basis than anyone else.

Acknowledgements

IN addition to her work with projects and compiling the DGP products' inventory, Lundholm made a number of contributions to the development of this book. I am greatly indebted to Maynard Reynolds for his participation in conceptualizing, planning, and organizing the contents of the volume and for contributing the chapters.

Bonnie Warhol, the NSSP secretary, prepared the camera-ready copy, a task that required some of her intelligence and all of her good nature.

Sylvia W. Rosen was the production editor.

Bert L. Sharp

University of Florida

References

Birch, J. Mainstreaming: Educable mentally retarded children in regular classes. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Davies, D. Working in and through support systems: Reflections. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), National technical assistance systems in special education. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, 1974.

Deno, E. Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1972.

Gazvoda, M. W. Project demographies and outcomes. In National Support Systems Project, The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis, MN: Author, 1980. (The chapter was based on Gazvoda's dissertation research to fulfill the requirement for the Ph.D. at American University.)

Okun, K. A. Deans as change agents: Testing assumptions of the Dean's Grant program. In C. R. Sivage, J. M. Bryson, & K. A. Okun, Politics, power, and personality: The roles of deans in Dean's Grant Projects. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982, 127-66.

Reynolds, M. C. A framework for considering some issues in special education. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28, 367-370.

Reynolds, M. C. Summary of conference. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), National technical assistance systems in special education. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, 1974.

Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1980.

Sivage, C. R. Advocates of change: An analysis of deans' roles as directors of Dean's Grant Projects. In C. R. Sivage, J. M. Bryson, & K. A. Okun, Politics, power, and personality: The roles of deans in Dean's Grant Projects. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982, 1-70.

The Dean's Grant Initiative: Fostering an Agenda of Shared Responsibility in Teacher Education

George Hagerty, Thomas Behrens, & Marty Abramson

Special Education Programs
U. S. Department of Education

ABSTRACT: The Dean's Grant program is designed to assist schools, colleges, and departments of education and affiliated professions in the revision of their preparatory programs for both undergraduate and graduate students. A primary objective of the faculty development and curriculum revision activities traditionally associated with the program is the infusion of those instructional competencies that will be required by current and future generations of personnel to more effectively serve the full range of children placed in the regular school environment. To date, about 260 institutions have participated in the Dean's Grant program. This chapter describes the origins of this national initiative and reviews the evolution, status, and potential future of the innovative, field-responsive enterprises.

THE 4.23 million handicapped students currently enrolled in America's public schools continue to challenge the educational community in general and teacher-education program personnel in particular. Although the rights of handicapped children and

---

Dr. George Hagerty is a Senior Program Specialist and Area Advocate for Regular Education-Preservice programing in the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education.

Dr. Thomas Behrens is Acting Director of the Division of Innovation and Development, Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Formerly, he was the Area Advocate for Dean's Grant Projects in the Division of Personnel Preparation.

Dr. Marty Abramson is currently a Senior Program Specialist with the Division of Education Services, Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. In this position he is involved in research and evaluation activities related to the preservice and inservice preparation of educators and related service providers.

SP 023 245

youth to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment is affirmed by both professional consensus and federal and state statutes, debate continually has focused on the capacity of the educational system to adequately coordinate and deliver the range of services required by the general population of exceptional learners. The principles and procedures conveyed through Public Law 94-142 - the right to education, least restrictive alternatives, individualized programing, and due process - require schools to employ teachers and support staff who are competent in both their professional specialty and establishing mutually supportive, cooperative relations with colleagues, parents and students.

Providing for the education of handicapped children and youth is truly becoming a shared responsibility. Approximately 68% (U.S. Department of Education, 1982) of those children identified as handicapped spend some portion of the school day in regular classrooms. An additional 25% who manifest more severe handicapping conditions are served in separate classes in regular school buildings. Thus, all but a small proportion of exceptional students receive instruction in school environments where the opportunities for substantial interactions with nonhandicapped peers and regular school staff are possible. However, the quality of the interactions and the effectiveness of the educational services provided appear to be highly variable and largely dependent upon the preparation, direction, and motivation of the administrative, instructional, and support personnel in a given school.

In their on-going study of the ecology of quality schools, Hersh and Walker (1982) argued that the environments that have the greatest educational impact on children are those in which there are found (a) high teacher expectations, (b) a strong sense of efficacy, (c) clearly communicated rules for social behavior, (d) strong administrative leadership, (e) parent support, and (f) an instructional technology that maximizes students' work. These dimensions are the fundamental ingredients of a fine-tuned social organism. If we know what factors are present in schools that are effective with children exhibiting marked individual differences, it is only logical that we, as trainers of teachers and administrators, concentrate our efforts on understanding these factors and effecting change accordingly. However, our emphasis should not be on isolating discrete elements but, rather, on affecting the whole by changing the parts.

The primary objective of the Dean's Grant initiative was to influence positively the educational system by revitalizing teacher education to make the regular school environment a more receptive and effective instructional setting in which to serve an expanding range of diverse students, particularly handicapped children and youth. The intended outcome of this federal effort was not perceived by its architects to promote some idealized renascence in American education. Rather, the initiators of the Dean's Grant program realistically envisioned an evolving network of schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) collectively devoted to improving services to children. Advances in existing services would result from the preparation of a cadre of highly skilled graduates at the baccalaureate, master's and doctoral levels. First, however, traditional teacher-education curriculum would have to be refined to reflect the knowledge and skills required by generations of future regular classroom teachers, special educators, administrators, and related service providers to understand and function in the renegotiated roles extant and evolving in the schools.

Antecedents of the Dean's Grant Initiative

IN their review of the historical development of programs for handicapped children in the United States, Reynolds and Birch (1977) observed that advances in the practice of special education, which paralleled improvements in other segments of the human services community, rarely "took over" suddenly. Changes in the mode and content of service delivery characteristically progressed at a slow and less than uniform rate. The heightened momentum and "urgency in action" that emerged in the late 1960s and expanded throughout the 1970s to protect the rights of handicapped students was largely the result of a coalescence of major societal forces: judicial, legislative, professional, parental, and the general public. The right-to-education mandate embodied in Public Law 94-142 and comparable state statutes not only imparted new legal responsibilities to the educational community but, in a more profound sense, established a host of fresh professional challenges requiring immediate attention. The importance to educational practitioners, teacher educators, and policy makers of the progressive legislation being promulgated on behalf of exceptional learners was the degree to which it encouraged increasing diversity in the classroom. The transition of the regular school environment from a place of exclusion to a setting fostering more inclusive arrangements for handicapped children and youth demanded detailed planning, collaboration, and consistent and committed action by the entire educational system and the larger community of advocates, parents, and students which it served.

Although the field of special education experienced tremendous advances in the areas of knowledge, theory, diagnosis, and instructional techniques (Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978; Reynolds & Birch, 1977; Schofer & Chalfant, 1979), the advances were directed primarily to educational models relying on "pull-out" strategies, that is, the removal of handicapped children from regular classrooms for a portion of each school day to provide them with appropriate special services. For all practical purposes the prevailing arrangement isolated professionals and, in turn, created separate, degenerative subsystems (i.e., regular education and special education) through which handicapped children passed to receive appropriate services.

Attempts to study more effective methods of educating mildly, moderately, and severely handicapped populations were made in the late 1960s. These research and development activities were stimulated by federal and state discretionary funds (Council for Exceptional Children, 1976). Paralleling these advances in direct service provisions was the unprecedented expansion of special education training programs at institutions of higher education across the nation (Burke, 1977; Schofer & Chalfant, 1979; Smith, 1977). Again, federal support provided through legislation such as Public Laws 88-164 and 91-230 served as significant stimuli for the growth of teacher education and leadership preparation. By Fiscal Year 1974 (Academic Year 1973-74), the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) had established the following range of broad funding categories:

- General Special Education
- Severely Handicapped
- Early Childhood Handicapped
- Vocational and Career Education
- Physical Education
- Regular Education
- Volunteers, including Parents
- Recreation
- Interdisciplinary Training
- Paraprofessional Training
- Model Development and Implementation (Special Projects)
- Developmental Assistance (Post-Doctoral Training)

Prior to 1974, the massive training demands for regular educators, administrators, and other nonspecial education personnel were met by limited federal, state, and local support for inservice activities. Federal funding for the specialized inservice preparation of regular educators was assumed to be catalytic in nature. Discretionary funds were awarded for the development, initial implementation, and assessment of model inservice programs, including consortium arrangements (Siantz & Moore, 1977). The collection of individual efforts was determined to be practicable and effective (AMS, 1981), but the relative scarcity of available federal resources and the scope of practitioners' knowledge and skill deficits required a rethinking of prevailing approaches to professional development.[1]

State-wide study committees, composed of representatives from institutions of higher education, state and local educational agencies and consumer/advocacy groups, were formulated for the purpose of analyzing existing personnel-preparation programing in each state, and to consider alternatives to these efforts. Included in most deliberations was the consideration of appropriate certification requirements for regular educators, with particular emphasis on the establishment of acceptable knowledge and skill standards for classroom teachers who would serve an expanding population of students with diverse handicaps. The outcome of these activities pointed to the critical need for a refinement of the concepts and content found in traditional undergraduate and graduate teacher-education programs (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978).

Defining the Dean's Grant Program

THE Dean's Grant (or Regular Education - Preservice REGP) program was conceptualized to address the needs of future generations of regular classroom teachers, administrators, and related service providers in the country. The program was developed in tandem with the federal government's Regular Education - Inservice (REGI) program that was designed to upgrade the skills of those educational personnel already employed in the nation's schools. The intention of the simultaneous underwriting of these ambitious enterprises was to realize both an immediate (REGI) and prolonged (REGP) influence upon the quality of educational services pro-

---

[1]The magnitude of the problem of providing the population of 1,809,000 regular educators with adequate inservice training is highlighted by data derived from both an AMS survey (1981) and State Plans (1982) submitted to Special Programs, U.S. Department of Education. When aggregated, these reports indicated that only 37% of regular classroom teachers received any inservice preparation for instructing handicapped students during the academic year 1979-1980. The average number of hours in which regular educators participated in these inservice activities was 12.1 (as compared with 21.3 hours for special educators). Additionally, state data suggest the possible evolution or perpetuation of an imbalance in the content of inservice training provided to regular education personnel. Inservice activities delivered to regular educators in 1979-1980 were three times more likely to be oriented toward training content in awareness and knowledge relative to educating handicapped students than in skill practice and application. By contrast, inservice training provided to special educators during the same time period was fairly balanced in content (i.e., trainee development in awareness, knowledge and skill areas, with a significant increase in activities leading to competence in skill application).

vided to handicapped students (as well as their nonhandicapped peers).

During the spring of 1974, staff from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) held discussions on future agency priorities with professionals representing teacher education, state agencies, local school systems, and consumer groups. Foremost on the agenda in these deliberations was the development of a plan of action that would respond to the collective findings of the on-going Statewide Study Committees. Subsequent to these meetings, it was decided that an effort to stimulate the refinement of traditional teacher-training programs was imperative, and, in fact, that it could assist in the timely infusion of developing, innovative special education training sequences.

The resulting Dean's Grant program was announced in a July 1974 "Dear Colleague" letter to deans across the country by Edwin Martin, then Deputy Commissioner of Education. The program objectives specified in this correspondence included the following:

- The development of instructional competencies pertaining to the education of handicapped students for regular education personnel, including "elementary educators, secondary educators, principals, supervisors, superintendents, career/vocational educators, and other personnel...."
- The "reforming of training sequences and curricula" which promote the infusion of the competencies in response to the individual challenges of children, including the handicapped, who require additional attention.
- The establishment of projects which incorporate the following programmatic elements:

  1 - Dean or equivalent administrator as the project director.

  2 - A plan which proposes the revision of the teacher education program; modification should be beyond the mere addition of one or two courses.

  3 - Evidence of strong special education faculty involvement and commitment.

  4 - An initial three year timeline for program implementation.

  5 - A delineation of project outcomes including but not limited to: Changes in curricula, impact upon School/Col-College operation, benefits to program graduates, and projected impact upon handicapped and other children "whom the program's graduates will serve." (Martin, 1974)

If one common element was present among the original Dean's Grant applicants, it was diversity. Initial cycle submissions (i.e., 1975-1978) were disparate in geographic locations, institutional size and composition, type of personnel involved, and scope and nature of proposed programing (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978). Competitive proposals consistently focused the application narratives to address the following critical areas (Clair, Hagerty, & Merchant, 1979):

Need: Proposals described the needs for faculty development

and curriculum revision which were determined through systematic and thoroughly documented institutional needs assessments. This information represented the perceptions of all participating sectors of the school, college, or university. Additionally, model Dean's Grant programs sought the participation of those constituencies ultimately affected by the reconceptualized training curriculum (i.e., students, parents, personnel from LEAs and SEAs, and advocacy organization representatives).

Project Influence: Applications clearly defined the project-training audience(s) and delineated the anticipated influence of curricular redevelopment strategies for each of the proposed audiences. The proposals frequently identified the field-based concerns which would be addressed through project support and described the expected results of training and curricular development in terms of definable modifications in educational program content and the sequence of course offerings. In addition, project results usually were defined in terms of measurable improvements in faculty and student knowledge and skill acquisition, as well as attitude change.

Depending upon the content of the individual project need statements and the identified training populations, Dean's Grant Project activities focused on the competencies required for one or more of the following roles and environments.

Service Role	Setting
. Elementary educator	. Regular preschool, elementary or secondary classrooms
. Secondary educator	. Head Start programs
. Early childhood educator	. Resource rooms
. Special educator	. Vocational program settings
. Vocational/career educator	. Community-based programs (both academic and extracurricular)
. Counselor	. Local, intermediate, and state administrative unit programs
. Bilingual educator	. Community educational and health programs
. Administrator	. Consumer/advocacy agencies
. Physical educator	
. Recreation professional	
. Paraprofessional	
. School nurse	
. School psychologist	
. School social workers	
. Other related service providers (e.g., occupational therapists, physical therapists, rehabilitation personnel)	

Program Accomplishments: Strong proposals characteristically described a sequence of faculty and program-development activities to promote the special education and regular education domains. Effective projects, traditionally, were organized around the following components:

. The assignment of a project advisory committee composed of project staff, representatives of participating institutional units, and personnel from external educational agencies and consumer groups.

. Collaborative faculty awareness efforts (leading to staff acceptance of necessary program modifica-

tions).

- Cooperative staff-development activities to insure the development of crucial and collectively determined competencies (i.e., attitude, knowledge, skills).
- Analysis of didactic and practicum content in existing teacher-education programing.
- Identification of additional program content pertinent to the education of exceptional children in regular classroom settings.
- Development and field testing of new curricular designs.
- Addition of new course content or total revision of the graduate and/or undergraduate program.
- Plan for an on-going evaluation, documentation, and refinement of the permanent reconceptualized curriculum.

Evaluations of Regular Education-Pre-service proposals were particularly favorable when applicants forecast the continuous participation of local school personnel and parents in project activities, and especially in those efforts related to the assessment and revision of practicum arrangements.

The extent of proposed revisions in each application was variable and specific to the needs of individual institutions. However, several basic areas of faculty/graduate competence were presupposed. In describing the University of Kansas program, for example, Kleinhammer, Chaffin, and Skrtic (1978) determined them to be as follows:

a. Knowledge of normal and differing learning patterns of students.

b. Knowledge and application of classroom assessment procedures appropriate to exceptional children.

c. Knowledge of curricular choices appropriate for exceptional children.

d. Knowledge of techniques for planning, delivery, and management of instruction for exceptional children.

e. Human relations and organizational skills essential to serving exceptional children and participation on IEP teams.

f. Knowledge of societal influences and issues related to exceptionality. (p. 149)

Project Evaluation: The majority of competitive applicants proposed an evaluation design incorporating instruments and data-management procedures that insured the methodical collection of assessment information, and reviewed, analyzed, and subsequently used the information for project refinement. The evaluation process was intended to provide for an accurate assessment of program function and, at the same time, to allow for the comprehensive documentation of all project activities. Evaluation instruments frequently included items such as the following:

* Formal surveys of staff, participating faculty members, undergraduate and graduate trainees, and, when appropriate, external agency participants.

* Narrative reports of project activities.
* Anecdotal records.
* Committee or discussion group minutes.
* Position papers and responses.
* Statistical research related to measurable effects of the project activities on the primary (faculty/pre-service trainee) and secondary (school, community, agency environment) audiences.

Early projects were supported at levels of approximately $35,000 per year. Funds were primarily employed for the release time of a senior faculty coordinator, secretarial support, consultants, and limited staff travel to promote interproject dissemination and network activities. The majority of the initial Dean's Grant Projects experienced a level of success (in meeting proposed objectives) equivalent to training programs supported under several other Division of Personnel Preparation funding categories. However, those programs that reported the greatest level of institutional influence commonly cited the following strategies as positive determinants:

. The active involvement of a primary academic administrator (i.e., dean or equivalent). Behrens and Grosenick (1978) suggested that these individuals have the authority, responsibility, and decision-making capability to bring about change. Projects in which the dean took a leadership role in planning and implementing the program - and not one of tacit approval - were projects which more easily accomplished critical curriculum revision objectives. (National Support Systems Project, 1981)

. The linkage of effective, practical teaching strategies with educational theory by means of the following approaches: The involvement of school-based practitioners as project trainers; the participation of classroom teachers, handicapped individuals and parents in project planning, implementation and evaluation; and the refinement of practica experiences to reflect changes in didactic offerings (Hagerty, 1981).

. The early and frequent use of team or consensus-building activities to promote a truly interdisciplinary effort (Clair, Hagerty, & Merchant, 1979; Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978; NSSP, 1981; Teaching Research, 1982). Those projects were particularly successful which viewed the special education faculty as an important element in, but not the sole contributors to, the curriculum refinement process. Effective projects continually elicited the input and participation of those disciplines and areas of the educational spectrum which would realize the most significant impact on the curriculum revision process, e.g., elementary education, secondary education, educational psychology, and vocational education.

The Expansion of the Institutional Network

THE initial federal investment in the Dean's Grant program totalled $1,400,000. During Fiscal Year (FY) 1975 (Academic Year

1975-1976), these funds supported 39 charter projects. Table 1 shows that from 1975 through 1980 categorical support in the area of Regular Education - Pre-service increased dramatically. Paralleling this growth in resources was a rapid expansion in the number and design of both Dean's Grant applications and institutional awards (Clair, Hagerty, & Merchant, 1979).

TABLE 1

Year	# of Projects Supported	Total Level of Funding
1975	--	1,400,000
1976	60	3,230,000
1977	75	3,230,000
1978	92	3,420,000
1979	117	6,486,000
1980	141	7,250,000
1981	132	6,187,000

Currently, about 260 colleges and universities have been Dean's Grant recipients for time periods ranging from one to seven years. This number does not account for the additional 56 institutions of higher education that have benefited indirectly from technical assistance activities or materials provided by several national or regional networks, notably the National Support Systems Project (NSSP), located at the University of Minnesota, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), located in Washington, D.C.

From the inception of the Dean's Grant program, both federal administrators and faculty members in participating institutions have recognized the need for substantive program and network supports to assist individual grantees in project implementation. The impetus for establishing a major technical assistance and support network evolved from the dual conditions that

- individual projects were developmental in nature and that, as a consequence, these "high risk" efforts focusing upon longitudinal faculty and curricular change would require a substantial system for the design and provision of supportive materials and technical assistance services; and
- no common forum or professional organization existed for the range of disciplines and issues addressed by the Dean's Grant program.

The two major networks (NSSP and AACTE) supported by the Division of Personnel Preparation during the tenure of the Dean's Grant program conducted and expanded upon the time-tested service functions administered by previous support projects in federal programs, such as Teacher Corps and Education Professional Development Act (EPDA) programing. They included the management of the following:

- Technical assistance activities (drawing upon the collective expertise of current and former Dean's Grant recipients).
- Material development and refinement activities (in which products focusing upon effective strategies for faculty and program change are promoted).

- Material/information dissemination activities (insuring the timely distribution and exchange of research findings, training strategies and promising service delivery models).
- Convening activities (providing opportunities, based upon national, regional or topical interests, for professionals involved in the specialized preparation of regular educators to discuss common concerns about current and future instructional designs and practices).

The multiple support activities administered by NSSP (1975-1982) and AACTE (1978-1981) were and continue to be valued by schools, colleges, and departments of education for their appropriateness and reliability in responding to critical resource needs. Two particularly noteworthy support strategies emanating from these national projects were the establishment of regional liaisons by the NSSP and the use of state associations by AACTE.

Under the NSSP project design, Dean's Grant Projects were formally organized into eight geographic regions. Each region was assigned a lead professional or liaison to act as principal coordinator, act in an advisory capacity to the larger NSSP national network, and, when requested, to provide direct and timely assistance to individual Dean's Grant Projects and prospective applicants. Annual regional meetings were convened at the discretion of the liaisons and were organized

- to act as a vehicle for sharing information;
- to enable individual attention to projects;
- to encourage regional assistance to problem solving; and
- to share ideas and materials, as may be available.

The central staff of the NSSP provided a myriad of supportive services. Activities included national training conferences, smaller topical conferences (convened across the nation), the organization of site visits, assistance in identifying and sharing materials among the projects, and the establishment of a publication and dissemination system.

The AACTE Project on the Education of the Handicapped creatively used the agency's organizational structure of state associations to accomplish the major objectives of

- disseminating information relating to the Dean's Grant program to AACTE member institutions;
- encouraging responses by its membership to federal mandates regarding the education of the handicapped; and
- stimulating the interest of increasing numbers of institutions in the Dean's Grant concept.

Frequent collaborations with NSSP and individual Dean's Grant Projects enabled AACTE to sponsor a variety of national, regional, and state conferences on critical issues in the specialized preparatory training of regular educators.

Current Programing and Future Directions

THE Dean's Grant program has been successful to the degree that it has accomplished both the explicit and implied following objectives:

- Establishing the education of exceptional students as an area of critical attention for teacher education institutions.
- Promoting models for curricular refinement/modernization in teacher-education institutions, primarily focusing on special education competencies.
- Advocating the shared responsibility of regular and special education for the provision of services to a substantial proportion of handicapped students (Sontag, 1982).

The realization of these objectives largely has been promoted through the use, by Dean's Grant program participants, of two major approaches to the reconceptualization of traditional teacher-education curricula. These general approaches are as follows:

1. The infusion of content relating to the education of handicapped children and youth into existing courses.

The majority of institutions with Dean's Grant Projects dedicated themselves to fundamental and complex strategies for change above the level required merely to add a course on handicapped students for all teacher trainees. In some teacher-education programs information and experiences relating to the education of handicapped pupils were included within the frameworks of existing courses. In this approach, the competencies that non-special education personnel should possess were identified and the graduate or undergraduate curriculum was reviewed to ascertain the courses and field experiences in which those competencies could be imparted.

Modular instruction emerged in some institutions as a form for infusing pertinent content into existing courses. The instructional modules frequently incorporated both commercially prepared and internally developed materials. These instructional resources have the advantage of being easily integrated into existing preparation programs. Modules also allowed for flexibility in the instructional format in that they could be used as resources by faculty members or incorporated in whole or part into the training sequence.

The infusion of information throughout the curriculum had some disadvantages, however. For example, it is more difficult to document that graduates have acquired instructional content when it is not neatly packaged in a single course. Also, there is danger that when components are widely dispersed in the curriculum of complex programs, the commitment of instructors to some components will diminish or be superseded, thus destroying the systematic approach to the content. An essential element to maintaining the value of the infusion of information, consequently, is the assignment of professional responsibility for the coordination and support of the program.

2. Comprehensive revision of teacher-education programs.

A basic revision of teacher-education programs may be the most significant response to the challenge of Public Law 94-142. This change process requires a reassessment and renegotiation of the relations among the different curricular units like the curricular redesign structured around the cluster of 10 capabilities identified in A Common Body of Practice for Teachers (Reynolds, Birch, Grohs, et al., 1980).

---

[2] A detailed discussion of the 10 clusters is presented by K. C. Lakin & M. C. Reynolds in "Public Law 94-142 as an Organizing Principle for Teacher-Education Curricula," in this volume.

A consequence of integrating the 10 clusters of capability with a comprehensively revised curriculum, is that faculty members (and, subsequently, students) are less likely to perceive special and regular education as separate and somewhat incongruous domains. Basic questions tend to arise, requiring active discussion and resolution, on such issues as the time or "life space" provided for teacher education; the resources available for teacher education; the renegotiation of arrangements for teacher education with faculty members from the liberal arts and the professional disciplines such as medicine and law; and the new roles of specialists and teachers in relation to parents and the community.

Regardless of the approach to faculty development and the curricular change deemed to be best suited to a particular institution's needs, it is evident that the Dean's Grant program has had a positive influence on the educational community. For example:

- Institutions that became the sites of Dean's Grant Projects produce approximately 38% of the nation's yearly output of new teachers (NSSP, 1980).
- Of those institutions that have completed at least the third programmatic year of Dean's Grant funding,
  - 72% reported completion of curricula revision,
  - 87% reported completion of faculty knowledge/skill objectives,
  - 88% reported significant increases in student knowledge/skill acquisition, and
  - 69% reported the completion of comprehensive program changes.
- Increasing numbers of consortium arrangements have been supported to insure an expanding influence upon smaller universities and colleges, particularly institutions serving rural populations (SEP, 1981).
- Projects have begun to insure the maintenance of professional standards that relate to individual differences by teacher-preparation programs. For instance, a recently funded AACTE project is designed to provide technical assistance to teacher-education programs in meeting the standards of special education adopted by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) (AACTE, 1981).
- In an initial survey of recent Dean's Grant Projects by the Teaching Research staff (1982), the following findings were documented:
  - "First-year projects seem to be of to a better and faster start when compared with earlier projects."
  - "The amount of [technical and material] assistance available through developed products is considerably more abundant now than it was for the early projects."
  - "Making curriculum changes and incorporating them into the degree program was the most successful and lasting part of the former projects."

However, two elements that are critical to the reconceptualization of teacher-education programs appear to require further attention; they are, particularly, the refinement of practicum experience and the collection of sufficient data on program graduates. It is somewhat disquieting to note the following

- Few of the former Dean's Grant Projects in a national survey (Teaching Research, 1982) reported the use of practicum and student teaching with handicapped students to complement revised coursework offerings, and less than 30% of the final reports submitted to SEP by Dean's Grant recipients indicate revisions in practicum experiences. It is imperative that institutions receiving Dean's Grants increase efforts to reinforce coursework with relevant practica experiences.

- A substantial number of projects (even those supported for 4-6 years) did not address the issue related to success of graduates. This failure is particularly problematic because the ultimate objective of the major Dean's Grant components (faculty development and curriculum refinement) is the positive effect of programing upon the knowledge and skills of graduates. It is encouraging to note, however, that several individual programs are in the process of developing instruments and collecting longitudinal data on the influence of the programs on the teaching effectiveness of graduates.

Recent discussions on the scope and nature of future Dean's Grant programing have centered on isolating continuing areas of need. Some refocusing or redefinition of the traditional Dean's Grant concept may be necessary, including the possibility of developing a revitalized master or peer teacher system and expanding practical, supervised experiences with exceptional learners during the pre-service training sequence. Additionally, it is clear that further investment in program development is warranted in the areas of doctoral training (leadership personnel) and programing in historically black institutions, small colleges and universities serving rural and urban populations (Sontag, 1982). The initial view of a revitalized Regular Education-Preservice program would encourage the design of projects that include the following features:

- A truly unique program design that incorporates innovative models/activities which are related to effective teacher training, research, and local service delivery. This may be accomplished through the development of consortium models for the training of deans (or their designees) in coordination with local school officials. This training would provide the persons who are responsible for policy development and implementation in colleges, universities, and local school districts with the skills and resources necessary to effectively manage the administration of training and service delivery activities related to the education of handicapped students.

- A detailed planning component which reflects intensive faculty and LEA involvement prior to proposal submission.

- Collaborative SEA/LEA advocacy activities.

- A delineation of the extent to which program objectives will influence the participating insti-

tution(s) of higher education and local educational agencies involved in the effort.

. The development of a comprehensive evaluation design which will assess project influence upon the functions of program graduates and handicapped students.

The Dean's Grant program continues to provide teacher-education personnel with the opportunity to reassess and renegotiate the professional relations integral to the provision of educational services to all children. At times, the process of professional examination, reflection, and change appears exceedingly slow and cumbersome. Over the seven-year history of Regular Education - Preservice programing, teacher educators have become increasingly cognizant of the complexities of the institutional change process. The tearing down and building up process proceeds simultaneously, and generally at a far slower pace than enthusiasts are willing to admit (Penner & Gilmore, 1977). However, numerous Dean's Grant recipients have developed and documented innovative strategies to enhance and increase the likelihood of the timely progression of critical events, for example, faculty development, program analysis, and curriculum revision. Successful grantees have generally learned - in an institutional sense - how to overcome negative influences, such as staff resistance, administrative inflexibility, and programmatic retrenchment.

Future efforts in schools, colleges and departments of education to explore alternative approaches for the preparation of committed and skilled educators will benefit from the collective wisdom and experience of the network of Dean's Grant Project institutions. Given the economic, social, and professional realities of the 1980s, the keystone of future initiatives to refine programs in teacher education and related disciplines (e.g., educational psychology), will require a substantial level of intra- and interinstitutional collaboration. Attempts by former and current grantees to document the critical dimensions of the change process - the motivation for the development of this volume - should serve as a crucial foundation for succeeding endeavors to reconceptualize the scope and content of teacher training.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). Training of regular educators for the education of the handicapped: Small liberal arts colleges and accreditation standards. A proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Washington, DC: Author, 1981.

(AMS) Applied Management Sciences. An assessment of inservice training of regular classroom teachers - Executive summary contract number 300-79-0775, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, 1982.

Behrens, T., & Grosenick, J. A historical perspective. In J. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Burke, P. Personnel preparation: Historical perspective. Exceptional Children, November 1976, 43(3).

Clair, J., Hagerty, G., & Merchant, D. Redesign for teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges

for Teacher Education, 1979.

Council for Exceptional Children. A helping relationship: Federal programs for special children. Exceptional Children, November 1976, 43(3).

Grosenick, J., & Reynolds, M. C. (Eds.). Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Hagerty, G. Status of Dean's Grant Programing - Internal Report. Washington, DC: Special Education Programs, 1981.

Hersh, R., & Walker, H. Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. In M. C. Reynolds & J. Brandl (Eds.), Public policy and the special education task for the 1980s: Report of the Wingspread Conference. Policy Studies Review, Special Issue, Winter 1982.

Kleinhammer, J., Chaffin, J., & Skrtic, T. University of Kansas Dean's Grant Project: A case study. In J. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Martin, E. Dear colleague correspondence announcing the Dean's Grant initiative. Washington, DC: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, July 1974.

National Support Systems Project. The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis, MN: Author, 1980.

Penner, W., & Gilmore, J. CBTE in special education: Competency assessment. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department, 1977.

Reynolds, M. C., & Birch, J. Teaching exceptional children in all America's schools. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1980.

Schofer, D., & Chalfant, J. The Missouri symposium on doctoral programing in special education: Considerations for the 1980s. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 1979.

Siantz, J., & Moore, E. Inservice programing and preservice priorities. In J. Smith (Ed.), The map, the mission and the mandate: Personnel preparation and P.L. 94-142. Washington, DC: Division of Personnel Preparation, U.S. Dept. of Education, 1977.

Smith, J. (Ed.). The map, the mission and the mandate: Personnel preparation and P.L. 94-142. Washington, DC: Division of Personnel Preparation, U.S. Dept. of Education, 1977.

Sontag, E. Perspectives on the status and future of special education and regular education. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), The future of mainstreaming: Next steps in teacher preparation. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1 Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036), 1982.

Teaching Research (Baldwin, V. et al.). Executive summary of a national survey of regular education pre-service projects. Monmouth, OR: Author, 1982.

U.S. Department of Education. Annual report to Congress on the implementation of Public Law 94-142. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982.

Dean's Grant Projects: Progress and Prospects

Maynard C. Reynolds

University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT: A 37-item questionnaire was distributed to DGP directors, coordinators, and teacher educators, who participate in the operations of Dean's Grant Projects, at the annual meeting of DGPs held in April 1982. About 65% of the conferees responded to the questionnaire by choosing responses on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The subjects covered by the questionnaire were as follows: The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Teacher Education; The Progress of Dean's Grant Projects; Changes in the Schools: Implications for Dean's Grant Projects; New Approaches in Future DGPs; The Need for Quality in Teacher Education; and Temporary Support Systems: Needs of the DGPs.

WHAT has been the impact of Public Law 94-142 on pre-service teacher education? Have Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) played a significant role in implementing the principles of Public Law 94-142? Should the projects be continued? If so, should new approaches be explored? What new strategies, in addition to or instead of DGPs, might be used to bring teacher preparation into accord with current policies for the education of handicapped students?

Answers to such questions are important to many people: to educators who seek seriously to make teacher-preparation programs more adaptive to the needs of handicapped pupils, to federal officials who administer the Dean's Grant program, to members of Congress, who must consider education budgets and priorities in the context of overall needs, and to advocates of handicapped children who must be informed to function in the children's best interests.

Dr. Reynolds is a Professor of Special Education in the Department of Educational Psychology. He was the Director of the National Support Systems Project during its existence.

SP 023 246

Starting in 1975 the National Support Systems Project (NSSP) tried to provide leadership for DGP participants in addressing general questions on the revision of teacher education and specific questions on the progress and prospects of DGPs. Five years later NSSP reported in The Dean's Grant Projects: A Descriptive Analysis and Evaluation (NSSP, 1980) on a survey in which experienced DGP personnel and NSSP Advisory Board members were asked for their opinions and observations on the work of DGPs. The report summarized the findings as follows:

> DGPs have been a success in the first five years of the program. Strong models for teacher education now exist that take into account the policies of Public Law 94-142: the curricular implications of the new policies have been explored and a new literature is being developed; and cooperative linkages have been established among institutions and professional organizations to help to disseminate new insights and products. In sum, the DGPs and the institutions in which they operate represent a significant and growing resource for the further work to be done in implementing Public Law 94-142. Indeed, Dean's Grant Projects may very well have helped to open important new perspectives on and enlist a new source of energies for teacher education in general. (NSSP, 1980, p. vi)

Rapid changes in the political and economic climate over the past two years prompted another survey of DGP personnel and Advisory Board members. The questions were presented during the national DGP meeting in a Minneapolis suburb in April 1982. Questionnaires were completed by 139 people, about 65% of the conference participants. All respondents were associated with institutions of higher education; about half were deans of education and the remainder were mostly members of education faculties and coordinators of DGPs.

The program of the meeting consisted of a series of future-oriented papers, all related to teacher education and Public Law 94-142, and subsequent small-group discussions on the themes of the papers. Conference participants were asked to complete the 6-part questionnaire, which contained 37 items, during the course of the meetings by choosing responses on a 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SA), through Agree (A), Uncertain (U), Disagree (D), to Strongly Disagree (SD). Comments to explain responses and views were also solicited.

The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the thinking among DGP directors and active participants for the future directions of teacher education and the functions of DGPs. Responses are organized according to the following six major topics and six corresponding tables.

The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Teacher Education	Table 1
The Progress of Dean's Grant Projects	Table 2
Changes in the Schools: Implications for Dean's Grant Projects	Table 3
New Approaches in Future DGPs	Table 4
The Need for Quality in Teacher Education	Table 5
Temporary Support Systems: Needs of the DGPs	Table 6

In identifying items of the questionnaire, a number refers to the table and a letter to the item within each table. For example,

Item 1a refers to the first item in Table 1.[1] When they add depth to the tabulated responses, the anonymous observations and comments of deans and project coordinators are quoted.

The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Teacher Education
(Table 1)

PARTICIPANTS in DGP activities believe that Public Law 94-142 has had an important but less than revolutionary influence upon preservice teacher education programs.

- o "Public Law 94-142 caused a bureaucratic but not a substantive revolution."
- o The law "did not set off any fireworks" in teacher education "but slowly, carefully and deliberately we have started, and will continue to change attitudes of teacher educators."

In Table 1, item 1a shows that 75% of the respondents agree (26%, strongly) that the principles of Public Law 94-142 are well established and will continue to guide future developments in the schools and in teacher preparation. In item 1b, a smaller but still major proportion (65%) of the respondents affirm the importance and revolutionary nature of the law's principles. However, it is interesting to note that although the same percentage of respondents (14%) expressed uncertainty with each question, almost twice as many indicated disagreement with item 1b.

Given the extent of the acceptance of the principles in Public Law 94-142 (item 1a), do we see a closer working relation between regular and special education in teacher-preparation programs? Only 44% of the respondents agree (see item 1c) that the renegotiation of relations between the two areas has been successful. The proportion of "Undecideds" is slightly higher than that of the "Disagrees," which may indicate difficulty in interpreting the available evidence.

- o Many close observers feel that the "concepts [of Public Law 94-142] are not widely internalized" yet by teacher educators and that a few are "waiting for the law to be repealed."
- o Some see the college faculties as "still teaching about the law rather than about its implementation."

More than one respondent noted,

- o If there is a "federal retreat from the concepts of Public Law 94-142, we will see the erosion of present trends toward the implementation of the law."
- o "In the absence of national leadership...the more usual concepts of efficiency-economy, and the 'route of least resistance' will overtake" present efforts to implement the law.

---

[1]The order in which items are presented in the tables and in discussions is only approximately the same as in the original questionnaire. The percentages for each item do not add up to 100 because not all respondents answered all questions. Readers who wish to have a copy of the questionnaire should write to the author (Reynolds). Four items which proved to be ambiguous resulted in unusable responses and are omitted in this report.

Table 1

Responses to Items on The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on Teacher Education

	Percentages				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
1a. The major principles expressed in P.L. 94-142 (such as the right of all children to free and appropriate education, due process, least restrictive placement, etc.) are well-established and will continue to serve as important guides to future developments in the schools and in teacher preparation.	26	49	14	8	1
1b. The implications of the principles inherent in P.L. 94-142 are very important and are causing revolutionary changes in the schools and in teacher preparation.	19	46	14	16	1
1c. The renegotiation of relationships between "regular" and "special" education in teacher preparation programs has been successful and is likely to continue into the future.	6	38	29	25	2
1d. The mission of the DGPs is largely accomplished. Federal financial supports are little needed for more than about three to five years into the future.	3	11	13	42	29

Most DGP deans and staff members feel that federal supports for DGPs will need to be continued for more than 3-5 years in the future (see item 1d), and that,

- o Efforts for change "will largely disappear without the money," as in the federal support of DGPs.
- o "If it was thought that such a task [changing teacher education] could be accomplished in six or seven years, it would have been better if we had not begun."

Other respondents noted the importance of continued advocacy by parents of handicapped children as a necessary condition for change in teacher preparation.

- o "Parents won't permit a reversal" of the provision of Public Law 94-142."
- o Progress is "likely to continue only if pressures continue from parents and field personnel."

In sum, it appears that the response of teacher educators to Public Law 94-142 is substantial but less than spectacular. The necessary innovations are coming into existence slowly, as part of a deliberate process.

- o "After the critical uproar of the regular teachers, the changes are coming about gradually, subtly, and quietly."

Few respondents were sanguine about the future, should federal leadership be seen as eroding. Without strong pressures for revisions in teacher-preparation programs. the future does not look promising. Most respondents feel that it is important to continue DGPs for a substantial period to realize the necessary changes in teacher education.

The Progress of Dean's Grant Projects (Table 2)

IN one chapter of the 1980 NSSP summative report, Gazvoda (1980) discussed her investigation of all DGPs operating during the 1979-80 academic year. One source of her data was self-ratings of project staff members. These data showed that by the fourth or fifth year of operations, 72% of the institutions in which DGPs were located had made extensive or complete revisions in their teacher-preparation curricula. Seven out of eight respondents, Gazvoda reported, rated the members of their teacher-education faculties as knowledgeable about Public Law 94-142 and in more than half the institutions major program changes were reported as accomplished by the third year. However, revisions in practicums were reported still to be problems: less than half (42%) the respondents reported extensive alterations in practicums, even in the fourth and fifth years of operation.

In the 1982 survey, 75.5% of the respondents rated DGPs as successful in achieving their objectives although about one in five was uncertain that the projects were working out well (item 2a).

- o A number of respondents commented that DGPs "require time" and that often a "foundation is laid" in early years and the important progress occurs later.

Several respondents observed that the new NCATE[2] standard relating to handicapped children was beginning to have "clout," and that the clearest evidence of it was in DGP institutions. Item 2b indicates that only a minority (18%) rated the NCATE activity as strictly a "special interest" effort; most saw that accreditation development as a definite positive step.

Responses to the general query (item 2c) on the potential for strongly progressive leadership and quality monitoring in

---

[2]National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education: The so-called special education standard becomes effective in accreditation work of 1982 and later. It sets high expectations for appropriate curricular components in all teacher-preparation sequences for dealing with the educational needs of handicapped students.

Table 2

Responses to Items on The Progress of Dean's Grant Projects

		Percentages				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
2a.	In general the Dean's Grant Projects have been successful in achieving their objectives.	23	53	21	1	0
2b.	The new NCATE standard on special education is but another example of the work of a narrowly framed special interest group.	5	14	17	38	19
2c.	General structures for leadership and quality monitoring in teacher education (such as AACTE, NCATE, State Certification Officers, etc.) are incapable of strong, progressive leadership of the kinds needed to implement P.L. 94-142.	12	34	16	29	8
2d.	Special education in general and the Dean's Grant Projects, in particular, have "bitten off more than they can chew" and are proceeding in unrealistic fashion to try to change all of teacher education.	4	8	5	53	29
2e.	The Dean's Grant Projects have served to demonstrate that deans (or directors, etc.) of education are able to provide significant leadership in accomplishing important changes in professional programs and that more of the resources for training which are directed to colleges of education in the future should be sent through central college officers rather than to narrowly framed components of a college.	34	35	13	10	4

teacher education of professional organizations and agencies were less one-sided: 51% agreed that AACTE, NCATE, and state certification officers are incapable of strong, progressive leadership of the kinds needed to implement Public Law 94-142, but 37% disagreed with the statement and 16% were undecided. The comment of one conference participant is informative:

- "Regular education faculty have bought into mainstreaming through their professional subject matter or higher education organizations...."

Despite the indications that DGPs lead to general revisions of teacher-preparation programs, occasional critics have characterized the projects as overly ambitious and unrealistic, of trying to reform teacher education too broadly. This view is not shared by most directors and staff members of DGPs (see item 2d). More than 70% of the respondents rejected the idea that their projects had been too expensive. One commentator asserted,

> o Even in national perspective "dean's grants have been the catalyst for much of the positive movement in teacher education in the... last 5 to 6 years."

An interesting facet of the DGPs has been the centrality of deans or directors of teacher education in the projects. A strong majority (68%) of DGP staffers agreed with item 2e. The dean's leadership has been a positive feature of the Dean's Grant program and indicates that, indeed, future consideration should be given to awarding teacher-education grants to central college. The comments on this item suggest, as can be expected, that,

> o Leadership by deans is still "spotty" and unless they are "committed and skillful" as instructional leaders they may "impede progress."

In sum, involved personnel rate DGPs as successful in achieving faculty awareness and curricular changes. Many projects undertake broad programmatic changes as well; these activities reflect a dedicated and hopeful spirit, and few project participants would have it otherwise. The "experiment" of making deans of education the central figures in DGPs has proved to be successful; when the deans make a strong, personal commitment to the DGPs' goals, the projects themselves seem to be particularly successful.

Changes in the Schools: Implications for DGPs (Table 3)

AT the base of most discussions at the 1982 NSSP national meeting of DGP deans and coordinators were the changes occurring in the schools in response to Public Law 94-142. It is axiomatic that changes in on-the-job functions must be recognized in preparation programs is the people on the line are to meet expectations and perform at the desired level.

> o "Colleges of education respond to change, rather than to create it."

Thus, awareness of the changes that were taking place in elementary and secondary public schools often has been the first step in revising teacher-education programs.

Table 3

Responses to Items on Changes in the Schools:
Implications for Dean's Grant Projects

	Percentages				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
3a. The social structures of school programs are becoming more complex as a result of the implementation in our society of mainstreaming, desegregation and right to education principles.	26	48	5	16	4
3b. Teachers should be expected to teach specifically for cooperative behaviors in diverse groups as well as for competitive and individualistic behaviors.	46	41	5	4	3
3c. If there is less money for education in the next decade, this means not only retrenchment, but also major restructuring of education--especially so in the case of expensive "special" programs.	37	40	8	8	2
3d. Present systems for categorizing mildly handicapped children (e.g., using labels such as educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed) are outdated and inappropriate and should be disbanded.	35	33	19	10	1
3e. It would be desirable for IHEs to undertake still broader forms of renegotiation and to try to bring together the now disparate elements in teacher preparation relating to bilingual education, ESL, multicultural education, migrant education, remedial teaching, education for the poor and disadvantaged, etc., as well as the elements of "special" and "regular" education.	48	42	6	1	1
3f. Systems for the categorical preparation of special education teachers for the "mildly handicapped" should be disbanded in favor of noncategorical or other non-labeling approaches.	38	34	14	9	1
3g. We may expect that many more programs of early education, including components relating to early identification and treatment of exceptionalities, will be developed in our nation.	19	47	18	9	2
3h. It seems likely that the funding of special education programs on the "input side" (getting more money just for identifying handicapped children) may be on the way out and that more emphasis will be given to "outcomes data as justification for funding.	24	45	17	9	3

DGP staff members seem to hold wide agreement that Public Law 94-142 mandates more inclusive arrangements for handicapped students in the mainstream environments and, thus, that the diversity of pupil characteristics in regular classrooms has been and will continue to be greatly increased. Note in item 3a that some 74% of the respondents agree (26%, strongly) that the social structures of mainstream classrooms indeed are becoming more complex.

It follows, then, that teachers should be prepared to deal with increasingly complex social structures. One form of such management is to induce cooperative and mutually supportive behavior among students in mainstream classrooms. Fortunately, much of the technology for carrying out classroom cooperation is well developed and a considerable literature is available. Relevant materials have been distributed by the NSSP (see Johnson & Johnson, 1981). Item 3b shows that 87% of DGP staff members agree that teachers should be expected to be competent in managing classrooms with diverse groups of students in order to enhance cooperative behavior.

Respondents in the present survey also see the mainstream movement as helping to break down the rigid separation of narrow, categorical programs. For example, it appears that the needs of so-called "educable retarded," "learning disabled," and "emotionally disturbed" children can be accommodated by a generic form of special education for the mildly handicapped. Reductions in education budgets support this kind of program integration because the maintenance of many separate programs, each with its special entitlement procedures, is patently inefficient. In response to item 3c, 7% of respondents expressed the belief that we face not only retrenchment but restructuring as well in "special" school programs. Retrenchment can be a positive force if it leads to the systematizing of individualized instruction.

Funding cutbacks sometimes have an opposite effect, of course, that is, they may cause even more rigidity and separation of programs if everyone seeks shelter in safe, traditional enclaves. But it need not be that way.

Many observers pointed out that restructuring that moves away from narrow categorization of children seemed "inevitable" and "already underway." One observer noted that the broad, unifying changes occurring in, especially, programs for mildly and moderately handicapped students, should be independent of financial arrangements; it is just that the present combination of mainstreaming and fiscal constraints has created stronger pressures for such a change.

The expected restructuring, according to most respondents, should include the bringing together of many "special" programs not only for students who are handicapped but also for those who are bilingual, multicultural, migrant, and disadvantaged. At least two-thirds (68%) of the survey participants agreed (35% strongly) that present systems for categorizing mildly handicapped students should be disbanded (see item 3d). In response to item 3e, 90% agreed that it is desirable for teacher educators to undertake a broad renegotiation of programs in these many special areas, not only to respond to desirable changes in the schools but, also, in order to unify the task of the colleges.

- Some observers saw the breaking down of barriers among special "territories" in the colleges as difficult and, surely, a matter in which the colleges are "not well suited to lead the way."

It is widely agreed that this restructuring does not necessarily mean a diminution in the needs and demands for specialists

in the schools; it does mean that the specialists mostly should be deployed in mainstream classrooms to carry out their work. Item 3f indicates that 72% of the respondents favor noncategorical or cross-categorical programs of preparation for teachers of mildly handicapped students. To be sure, some nay-sayers could be heard:

- o If we do away with some labels for children and teachers we "will just find other labels" in time.
- o The move toward noncategorical or generic specialists is "probably not feasible due to the politics of our advocacy organizations and of teacher certification."

These observations were much in the minority.

Another area of expected change, one that obviously is contingent upon new funding, however, is the development of early education programs. This move would emphasize the prevention of handicaps. Indeed, some 66% of the respondents foresee expanding emphasis on programs of early education for "special" children, including components relating to the early identification and treatment of exceptionalities (see item 3g).

- o One respondent noted, however, that "our culture is only now showing limited willingness to invest in preventive work."
- o Another observed that the widespread development of early education programs "must await a shift in our social and economic priorities."

Given these observations, the prevailing opinion seems to be that some expansion in demands for early education personnel can be anticipated in the near future providing sufficient political pressures develop. Such pressures may develop from industries and businesses that employ increasing numbers of mothers of young children. In any case, there will be special need to attend to the preparation of early education teachers in those aspects that equip them to serve handicapped and "high risk" children in their classes.

A last important area in which change is expected to make itself felt in the schools is that of accountability. It has been noted frequently in the past that funds for special education have tended to be generated on the "input" side; that is, special educators have been given money simply for identifying exceptional children and placing them in special programs. The results of the process were little observed and had no effect on the funding. According to the 69% of the respondents who agreed with item 3h, this pattern of funding will change and increasing emphasis will be placed on "outcomes" or evaluation data. In part, this conclusion is unavoidable, given the concentration on planning and evaluating programs for individual handicapped children, for example, in the preparation and review of IEPs (Individual Educational Programs). In the future, more attention unquestionably will be given to the plans for evaluation before funds are allotted to proposed programs.

In sum, DGP staff members see a major change occurring in the schools in response to the "least restrictive environment" principle expressed in Public Law 94-142. This arrangement supports the inclusion of more diverse groups of children in mainstream classrooms. The resulting increase in diversity requires that teachers be prepared to manage the predictable complex social interactions. In addition, generic rather than narrowly categorical programing to meet special needs can be anticipated,

which suggests a generic mode of special education teacher preparation to serve mildly handicapped students. Some growth in early childhood education, with emphasis on programs for handicapped or other "special" children is expected. Increased demand for evaluation of special education programs also can be anticipated.

New Approaches in Future DGPs (Table 4)

SUPPOSE you had the chance to start all over again on your Dean's Grant Project, would you proceed differently? If so, what would you do?

These questions repeatedly have been asked of DGP staff members. Those items in the 1982 survey that are relevant to such questions are reported in this section.

There is broad consensus that the problems of changing teacher education in response to Public Law 94-142 are fundamental rather than cosmetic or limited and, thus, the changes should concern all faculty members. Some 84% of the respondents agreed that basic reconceptualizations are required in such areas as measurement of individual progress and the role of parents in educational planning (see item 4a).

The basic nature of the changes is reflected also in response to questions on the involvement of foundations faculty members in curricular activities. About 3 out of 4 (74%) of the respondents agreed that the principles expressed in Public Law 94-142 were reason enough to stimulate the reworking of the foundations components of teacher education (see item 4b). The item that achieved the highest proportion of agreement (91%) among respondents is 4c: that foundations faculty must communicate better among themselves, across their own specialties, and with faculty members in other professional areas. However, DGP staff members, in general, are not willing to allocate more academic space or course credits in teacher-preparation programs to foundations courses (see item 4d). Commonly, preparation programs for teachers require only one or two courses in foundations subjects and many DGP staffers seem to consider the requirement sufficient. Some observers indicated that the proper time for expanding foundations study was after teachers were on the job, when they had a better conception of the fundamental aspects of their work. A few remarked that if foundations courses were made "more relevant and vital" they would be more positive about added offerings.

At the time of the 19-0 report, DGP staff members suggested that future DGPs would be well-advised to give early attention to programs other than teacher preparation, for example school administration. That recommendation is iterated in the 1982 survey (see item 4e). Indeed, 69% of the 1982 respondents agreed that attention should be given to fields like educational administration, counseling, and school psychology; and an even larger proportion of respondents agreed that programs should be developed in education to prepare all graduate students--our next generation of educational leaders--to base their professional practices on the social policies reflected in Public Law 94-142. Item 4f shows that 89% of the respondents agree that education graduate programs belong on the DGP agenda.

Considerable support appeared in the survey results for expanding the targets of DGPs to relate curricular reforms in teacher-education programs to those of health and related fields. More than 9 out of 10 (92%, see item 4g) respondents agreed that teacher educators should coordinate their programs with those in health, psychology, speech, and other fields that impinge on

Table 4

Responses to Items on

New Approaches in Future DGPs

		Percentages				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
4a.	Among the major problems of the future, as we consider the mission of DGPs, is to reconceptualize our approaches to such matters as classification of children, measurement of individual progress in education, the role of the parent in educational planning.	44	40	8	2	1
4b.	Foundations (of teacher education) faculty should consider the principles expressed in P.L. 94-142 as a major challenge and cause for the significant reworking of their programs.	36	38	12	11	1
4c.	It is important that more coordination in the planning and sequencing of instruction be achieved both within the "foundations" areas (as between specialists in measurement, philosophy, and sociology) and between foundations and professional ("methods") elements of teacher preparation programs.	50	41	2	5	0
4d.	More "space" in teacher preparation programs should be given to foundations areas.	8	19	29	31	8
4e.	Leaders of future Dean's Grant Projects would be well-advised to give early attention to fields like educational administration, counseling and school psychology, rather than to concentrate specifically on teacher preparation.	27	42	11	16	3
4f.	There is much need for development of programs which will serve all graduate students in education - our next generation of leaders - to acquaint them with principles expressed in P.L. 94-142.	46	43	5	4	0
4g.	Teacher educators are well-advised to seek common cause and programmatic collaboration across lines of health, psychology, speech and other related fields. Our graduates in these several fields should not graduate as professional strangers to one another.	65	27	5	1	1

education and upon the lives of handicapped children and their families. The interest of DGPs in the coordination has been stimulated, in part, by the work of the American Society of Allied Health Professions (ASAHP). Under the leadership of Carolyn Del Polito, a special project of the ASAHP has brought health and education professionals together for the precise purpose of encouraging coordinated responses to Public Law 94-142.

In sum, when DGP staff members look to the future they see the need for strong efforts to include all teacher-education faculty members in developmental and curriculum change efforts, especially in the very fundamental changes required to respond fully to Public Law 94-142. They also see the need for extending curriculum revision to include all graduate study areas in education, but with special emphasis on school administration, school psychology, and school counseling. Cooperative efforts between education and health-related training are regarded as essential also.

The Need for Quality in Teacher Education (Table 5)

A degree of tension has always existed within the DGPs on questions of how broadly and ambitiously projects should be pursued. For example, almost all projects have found serious "academic space" problems, that is, the lack of enough time in the typical undergraduate programs to permit curricular attention to be given to all important topics. Given this situation, should we work for an extended--possibly 5-year--preparation period for teachers? This and similar questions are considered in this section.

To start, DGP staff members agree that the "new federalism," which seeks to increase local and decrease federal responsibilities for planning, makes it more important than ever for deans of education to take the leadership in planning and monitoring programs. When "the Feds" say less and provide fewer supports, leadership inevitably devolves on the state and local agencies. Among the 1982 survey respondents, 77% agreed that the need is increasing for strong local responsibility for leadership and programmatic quality (see item 5a).

A highlight of the 1982 DGP national conference was the address by Thomas Gilhool of the Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia. A prominent public advocacy attorney, Gilhool was the counselor to the plaintiffs in the famous PARC case.[3] Several items on the questionnaire related to Gilhool's remarks.

Item 5b asked whether it would be a good idea for teacher education to be challenged in courts on "state-of-the-art" performance. The item is meant to propose the stimulation of higher quality in teacher education through legal challenge in much the same fashion that public schools and institutions for handicapped children and youth have been challenged over the past two decades on the delivery of services. In his address Mr. Gilhool made it clear that such actions should be seriously considered. The responses to item 5b indicate wide disagreement with the idea. Only 17% "Strongly Agreed" that such court tests would be wise.

- "It's the only way to get change."
- "If institutions are not pulled, kicking and screaming into modern practice, changes will not occur."

---

[3]Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 334 F Supp. 1257 (E.D.pa. 1971).

Table 5

Responses to Items on The Need for

Quality in Teacher Education

		Percentages				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
5a.	If the present trends toward the "new Federalism" continues, resulting in more programmatic leadership in education at state and local levels, it becomes all the more important that SCDEs give leadership along the lines of DGPs.	39	38	11	1	1
5b.	It would be a good idea to have a series of major court cases involving "state of the art" challenges to the field of teacher preparation.	17	19	23	25	15
5c.	Whenever local schools are caused by court findings and judgments to undertake "inservice training" activities for their staff, it would be a good and acceptable idea to have IHEs enjoined in the court orders. In this sense the teacher preparation institutions would make themselves co-respondents with the schools.	22	32	22	16	9
5d.	The field of teacher preparation is too diverse to permit general "state of the art" statements or a broadly shared professional culture.	2	18	12	41	27
5e.	It would be a good idea and a helpful step if some of the most successful Dean's Grant Projects formed a special network to advance ideas for the future and to work aggressively on political aspects of needed developments in fields such as legislation, funding, and professional affairs.	38	47	8	5	1
5f.	Schools, colleges and departments of teacher preparation should make their plans and claims now for the amount of academic or life space required for high quality teacher education.	55	34	7	1	1
5g.	The climate and timing are right (in 1982) for a major move for quality in teacher preparation.	49	32	8	6	3

- Such an approach "may provide the crises necessary to encourage growth. We, like all beings seem to follow the paths of least resistance. If that path goes through swamps, although we know that mountains exist with grand vistas, we stay in the swamp. We stay not because we like the dampness and the mire, but because we find the place predictable. To get us to move, we may need the crisis of law suits...."

At the same time, 15% of the respondents strongly disagreed with item 5b.

- "I see no new solutions coming from...court actions. In the long run I will place my bets on academic freedom and self-discipline, not on external, coercive forces. Let's start with an assumption that trust, cooperation, and intelligence will be our best weapons."

Some respondents took a qualified or intermediate position.

- Teacher education needs "just enough court cases to set some new guidelines."
- "We...do not seem to be evaluating programs effectively; so perhaps it is inevitable that the courts will do it for us."

Should the issue of state-of-the-art quality in public school education come before the courts, it may be advisable for colleges of education to join with the schools as co-defendants. Thus college of education leadership would be saying, in effect, "Given that it is our mission to participate in the provision of high-quality school programs through high-quality teacher preparation, and because the quality of the school operations is in doubt and under challenge, we choose to make ourselves co-defendants with the public schools." Item 5c shows that respondents were less than enthusiastic about this idea, nevertheless 54% expressed one or the other degree of agreement. One naysayer commented,

- "It is not evident...that our knowledge base will justify and prompt agreement on a large number of 'state of the art' statements."

In the case of DGP staff members, however, the prevailing view differs: 68% of the respondents to item 5d agreed that such statements are possible at this time. One respondent described the failure of teacher-preparation institutions to adopt a state-of-the-art standard as a major "cop out." Another respondent differed:

- "We would be naive to move precipitously on this issue."

It often has been observed that broad-based organizations tend to be conservative; to survive they must serve the needs of the majority, which means not "rocking the boat." In such a context a helpful step may be to bring together a few leaders from very progressive institutions to explore the issues and to lead toward 'state-of-the-art' standards of performance and monitoring. DGPs could provide such a structure. Interestingly, 85% of the respondents in the present survey agreed that such a move would be desirable (see item 5e). Some informal coalitions that might serve as prototypes already exist, for example, among institutions working toward extended teacher-preparation programs.

Perhaps the deliberate organization of such cooperation would be desirable.

A substantial amount of discussion has occurred regularly among DGP staff members about the problems of academic space or, as some term it, "life space" for teacher preparation. When faculties begin seriously to respond to the implications of Public Law 94-142 they often conclude that not enough academic time has been allocated for the study of all the important professional topics. On the other hand, teacher candidates also need strong programs in general education, which puts the problem well beyond simple competition for and division of existing space. The extension of preparation programs beyond the usual four-year bacculaureate level must be considered.

Item 5f was included in the survey to check attitudes toward the academic space issue and, specifically, to ascertain whether respondents thought the present time (1982) to be appropriate for making additional space demands. Some 89% of the respondents agreed that teacher educators should make their claims now for adequate life space to prepare high-quality teachers. Commentators tended to support this view strongly: "The need is critical." However, some suggested that "we missed that boat in the early 1970s." A number advised that, of course, in whatever moves that are made "we must be sure that we're using well the time we already have." One observer reflected,

- o "Going to a five-year program would take tremendous courage unless done multilaterally within a given state."

Another item dealt generally with the "climate and timing" for a broad major move toward quality in teacher education. More than four out of five respondents agreed that the "timing is right (1982)" for such a move (see item 5g). Many comments were offered.

- o The time "has been right for the last 15 years."
- o "It has always been the right time."

Less positive comments also were made.

- o "Two or three years from now, after the New Federalism thrust is reversed may be the right time."
- o "We cannot be assured that the current climate will... support the diverse, alternative-oriented procedures necessary for institutional moves toward quality."

In sum, DGP staff members favor strong moves for quality in teacher preparation <u>at this time</u>; such moves to include claims for the necessary academic space for quality programs, and strong efforts to specify state(s) of the art and to hold teacher educators accountable to such a level of operation. The wisdom of depending on the courts to force state-of-the-art performance met wide disagreement whereas the idea of forming small, ad hoc coalitions among institutions willing to work aggressively for reform and quality in teacher education is widely approved.

Temporary Support Systems: Needs of the DGPs (Table 6)

FOR seven years the National Support Systems Project (NSSP) has operated out of the University of Minnesota as a temporary technical assistance system for Dean's Grant Projects. As part of this assistance, eight regional liaisons have served projects in different regions of the country. The NSSP program has included

Table 6

Responses to Items on Temporary Support Systems:

Needs of the DGPs

	Percentages				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
6a. The dissemination of ideas in special project areas like DGPs requires temporary support systems, such as the NSSP, rather than to depend totally on regular professional publications and dissemination systems.	43	43	9	3	0
6b. Even if there is no funding for an NSSP-type activity beyond the current year, it would be a good idea to maintain some kind of voluntary, "Dutch Treat" national or regional networks of the DGPs.	60	35	1	1	0

national and regional conferences, site visits to projects, development of publications, dissemination of information, and various forms of technical assistance. NSSP also has helped to link DGPs to other organizations, such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Society of Allied Health Professions, and others. The operations of the NSSP conclude on September 30, 1982, about the time of this publication. Inasmuch as this termination was announced by the NSSP staff long before the 1982 national meeting, the data reported here are from a relatively open situation.

Item 6a shows that almost nine out of ten (86%) DGP members agree that some kind of temporary support system is essential to DGPs, at least to identify and disseminate ideas and materials developed by the projects. It should be noted that when DGPs started up seven years ago there were very few well-developed or tested ideas on needed faculty development and the kinds of curricular changes that institutionalized the response to Public Law 94-142. A period of very frequent communications among projects and a searching out of promising ideas seemed essential back in 1975 in order to achieve some structure in plans and to encourage rapid progress.

- "Temporary systems seem necessary to develop a strong concentration of interest for purposes of rapid progress."

It is doubtful that the major permanent professional organizations can accommodate the aggressive developmental and publications processes that are required in any rapidly developing field, such as that represented by the DGPs over the last seven years. The judgment of the respondents is overwhelming that even in 1982 there is a continuing need for a temporary support system.

It is very uncertain that the Special Education Programs unit of the U.S. Department of Education will wish or be able to support anything like the NSSP in the near future, considering the New Federalism policies in which local initiatives are emphasized. Of course, a form of self-help supports offers a possible solution. Locally funded DGP staff members could agree to meet nationally or regionally; they could maintain a communication network to exchange ideas; or they could confer as an enclave at meetings called by some other agency or organization. The possibility of voluntary organization is suggested in item 6b, and 95% of the respondents agreed (60% strongly) that the idea is a good one.

- "Networking--various forms of temporary system--seems to be an extremely potent type of organization in the mid- to late twentieth century."

Amid the expressions of general support for creating a network "from the grass roots up," observations like the following also were made:

- "It would test the altruism of all concerned."
- "There is no money for travel, so meetings will be very poorly attended."

Summary

THE views of a large number of deans and faculty members participating in the work of Dean's Grant Projects at different colleges and universities can be summarized as follows:

In general, the response by the teacher-education community to the principles of education and legal imperatives exemplified by Public Law 94-142 has been equivocal. Many members of that community are "unsold" on the principles. Nevertheless, progress in the adoption of the principles is believed to be occurring, if slowly, in many places. The adoption tends to be gradual, to be occurring within the context of evolutionary change processes. Clearly, the rate of change is not revolutionary. The new NCATE standard relating to handicapped children, the general leadership of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the specific efforts of national subject-specialty groups support the adoption of the principles.

In institutions in which Dean's Grant Projects are located, clearly the rate of progress usually is better than elsewhere, but even at these sites time is required to stir faculty development and to secure significant changes in teacher-preparation curriculums. A period of four to six years seems to be necessary for most DGPs to make substantial progress. There is virtually unanimous agreement that if federal initiatives and support for DGPs wanes, the desired progress will be slowed. Fortunately, a great deal of developmental work has been accomplished, as represented in the substantial literature assembled by the NSSP and many project staffs.

Current DGP staff members believe that future Dean's Grant Projects should give early attention to preparation programs for school administrators, school psychologists, school counselors, and graduate students in education (our future teacher educators and leaders) as well as for teachers. Additionally, they concur that deans of education should seek closer programmatic ties with their counterparts in the health-related professions.

Over-arching all these details in a rising concern that the reforms in schools and teacher preparation will not be realized without a major move by colleges to improve the whole of their

operations including both regular and special education and all faculty members. Certainly not the least among those requiring attention and support are faculty members in the foundations areas of teacher education because the reformation of education called for in Public Law 94-142 is indeed foundational. Basic beliefs, insights, and skills must be reexamined. In fact, what seems to be needed is a strong move for quality in teacher preparation that is based on the high aspirations expressed in Public Law 94-142: right to appropriate education, in the least restrictive environment, proceeding by explicit individualized plans which students and parents have helped to shape, and with decision processes that respect due process principles. Dean's Grant Project staff members, it appears, are quite ready to follow a very ambitious course in institutionalizing these principles, but still we need some method of convening and coordinating efforts at the national level if progress is to be strong.

References

Gazvoda, M. W. Project demographics and outcomes. In The dean's grant projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, College of Education, National Support Systems Project, 1980, pp. 15-28.

National Support Systems Project. The dean's grant projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, College of Education, Author, 1980.

Reconceptualizing and Restructuring an Undergraduate Teacher-Education Program

Robert L. Saunders & Barbara G. Burch

Memphis State University

ABSTRACT: With the support of a Dean's Grant Project from 1978-1981, the College of Education at Memphis State University reconceptualized and restructured its undergraduate teacher-education program. Activities during the first year concentrated on increasing faculty awareness of Public Law 94-142 and the concept of the least restrictive learning environment for handicapped students. During Year Two, faculty members and students were heavily involved in activities leading to broad curricular redesign and comprehensive staff development.

By the end of Year Two, two hypotheses were being tested: (a) In the main, competencies needed by teachers to teach handicapped students effectively are the same competencies needed to teach any student effectively. (b) Many competencies needed for effective teaching in K-12 settings are the same competencies needed for effective teaching in non-school settings.

During Year Three information and professional judgment were sufficient to accept both hypotheses. Consequently, by the end of the third and final year of the project a restructured, reconceptualized undergraduate program for preparing K-12 teachers was virtually completed, as was a new, parallel program for preparing educators for non-school settings. Both programs share a common, generic core of professional studies and have the capacity to accommodate both the letter and spirit of Public Law 94-142.

THE decision in the Spring of 1978 to apply for a Dean's Grant was clearly a logical move. For more than a decade the College of Education at Memphis State University had placed high priority on the preparation of teachers for work with handicapped students and on related programs and activities. During the preceding decade, for example, the number of faculty members and students graduating from programs in the Department of spe-

Dr. Saunders is Dean and Dr. Burch, Associate Dean for Programs, of the College of Education.

SP 023 247

cial Education and Rehabilitation more than doubled. The department's outreach activities encompassed the approximately 50 relevant agencies and organizations in the greater Memphis area. Indeed, the outreach activities extended across the United States and into several foreign countries where faculty members were significantly involved in teaching, consultative services, and leadership roles. In 1975, the College of Education won the AACTE Distinguished Award for Project Memphis, a program that created new knowledge and new techniques for diagnosing and treating handicapped infants, some as young as 6 months. Two textbooks and two years of national and international workshops and training sessions for educators (pre-service and inservice) resulted from Project Memphis along with benefits to children, their parents (real and foster), and the local courts that used evaluations by the Project staff to make decisions on the adoptability of handicapped infants.

The scope, level, and significance of our work in the area of education for handicapped persons also can be seen in the department's sponsored grants and activities; the peak occurred in 1977-78 with 11 projects totaling $911,000 in external funds. For the six years preceding and including 1977-78 the department obtained an average of $697,279 per year from external sources.

In other words, the College's interest in education for handicapped children was genuine. It was also comprehensive and had been sustained for over a decade. Our proposal for a Dean's Grant was accepted on May 5, 1978, we were notified of the award of $30,000. We committed $52,000 from our own funds for in-kind services and materials.

Year One

The Project Coordinator and Administrative Assistant were selected from members of the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. In its first year the Project was directed toward the achievement of the following four major gaols:

1. Provision of information to all College of Education faculty members regarding characteristics of handicapped individuals likely to be placed in regular classrooms and of curriculum alternatives available for educating such individuals.
2. Involvement of faculty members in processes likely to be engaged in by graduates who work with handicapped individuals in regular classrooms, such as writing I.E.P.s and identification and use of resources.
3. Provision of information regarding legislative requirements and procedural safeguards in referral, evaluation, and placement of handicapped individuals.
4. Development of resource information and personnel, in cooperation with the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, the State Department of Education, the National Support Systems Project, and local schools.

These four goals, essentially awareness building in nature, were pursued through six sets of activities:

1. Establishment of an Advisory/Leadership Team. The team, composed of department chairpersons and college unit directors, proposed to stimulate these members to assume leadership roles in important program and certification areas. The reason for focusing on both certification and broad program areas in the College was to institute appropriate curricular changes in all teacher-preparation areas and to accomplish these changes through appropriate faculty and staff-development efforts. The team met regularly and recommended strategies for reinforcing faculty and staff development in the College, particularly in the designated areas of certification.

2. Establishment of a Resource Center. Materials were acquired and made available to faculty members and for faculty and staff-development activities. The materials were housed in the College of Education's Learning Resources Center where they were given a highly visible and accessible space.

3. Determination of Faculty and Administrator Knowledge of Public Law 94-142. The following series of questions arose rather early in Year One:

"How knowledgeable are faculty members and administrators in the College about Public Law 94-142?"

"Are faculty members highly aware of both the letter and spirit of the Act?"

"Are they aware of the efforts already being made in local and area schools, K-12, and of the successes, failures, and the difficulties encountered?"

"What new topics and content in preparation programs do teachers and administrators recommend in view of their experiences in attempting to implement Public Law 94-142?"

To get at answers to these questions, a Faculty/Administrator Literacy Test was developed and administered. Reminders were sent out until over 90% of the staff had returned completed measures. The results were not at all encouraging. Only faculty members in Special Education and Rehabilitation were highly knowledgeable about the law. Indeed, some faculty members were unaware of the law per se, not to mention its requirements and its implications for teacher preparation. Thus we realized, even more strongly than before, that we needed organized and systematic procedures to make changes necessary to accommodate Public Law 94-142.

4. College-Wide Faculty and Staff-Development Sessions. Two college-wide development sessions were conducted:

a. Dr. Peter Fannin, State Director of Special Education, Colorado Department of Education, presented a program that focused on Public Law 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. About 60 faculty members in the College attended and participated in the Saturday morning sessions.

b. A faculty seminar was held in Nashville in which all 36 teacher-education institutions in the state were invited to participate. The meeting, co-hosted and conducted jointly by Memphis State University and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, was supported by other Dean's Grant Projects in the state. Topics included "Section 504," "Model Public School Programs," "Mainstreaming," "Implications of Public Law 94-142 for Higher Education," "The Right to Education Philosophy," "Higher Education State Education Agency Linkage," and "Due Process Hearings."

A total of 46 faculty members in the College of Education at Memphis State departed at 5:00 a.m. for the four-hour bus ride to Nashville, attended the five-hour meeting, and returned home the same day. The shared experiences of the day led to the development of a kind of rare esprit de corps, which was to serve us well throughout the duration of the project. They became known as the "Group of 46" and were viewed by their peers as being significantly involved in the project.

5. Use of Project as Leverage in Modifying Physical Facilities. Significant strides were made in modifying physical facilities at Memphis State as a result of the Dean's Grant. The modifications included installation of several ramps in critical

locations, curb-cuts, and wheelchair accommodations in restrooms. The changes were especially evident in the College of Education facilities.

6. Needs Determination. An ad hoc committee consisting of the Dean of the College, a Special Education representative, and the College's Bureau of Educational Research and Services met five times during the year to ascertain needs and to determine ways of meeting those needs as they related to the Dean's Grant and to teacher education at Memphis State.

Some Perceptions after Year One

The first year of operation of the Dean's Grant Project provided us with some good insights to and ideas about reshaping the project during its remaining years to impact maximally on our undergraduate teacher-education program overall. The following statements reflect our perceptions:

1. The project called for two thrusts, one in curriculum improvement, the other in faculty/administrative development. They caused us to move away from special education as an orientation base and to focus our efforts more toward improved teacher education, broadly conceived. At this point, the project was moved both administratively and physically into the Dean's office. The Associate Dean for Programs assumed the Project Coordinator position and was charged with the responsibility of incorporating whatever we decided to do in the way of course changes (to accommodate Public Law 94-142) into our college-wide efforts to develop an improved and more responsive teacher-education curriculum. Assistance was provided by a doctoral student from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation who served as Administrative Assistant for the Project.

2. We also realized that we should attempt no further "add-ons" to accommodate emerging needs, pressures, and mandates. To continue to accommodate new needs in patchwork fashion was certain to end up with a "crazy quilt" curriculum pattern.

3. The problems of programing and funding made us aware that we could not continue the specialization/fragmentation in our undergraduate program (approximately 30 specializations).

4. We then realized that in essence we would be testing the hypothesis that "the competencies needed by teachers to carry out the purposes of Public Law 94-142 would in most cases (perhaps 85%) be the same competencies that teachers needed to effectively teach any student." After all, for a quarter of a century educators have acknowledged that the essence of good teaching is taking students where they are and helping them to develop to their maximum potential. In reality, Public Law 94-142 simply extends the ranges of individual differences among students in classrooms, and accommodating these differences is, we believe, the real purpose of mainstreaming.

5. At this point it seemed both wise and expeditious to regard the Dean's Grant Project as a primary vehicle for reconceptualizing and restructuring the total undergraduate teacher-education program, and simultaneously to assure that the program effectively prepared teachers to meet the requirements of Public Law 94-142.

6. The results of an earlier and aborted experience during the period of 1971-74 were partially resurrected. We remained convinced that teacher preparation could and should be competency based, not just course-completion based, and certainly not instructor based (i.e., each instructor determining the objectives of each course).

7. We redefined the term "competency" to include three components: (a) knowledge mastery; (b) adequate and appropriate insights and philosophical meanings and understandings; and (c)

appropriate performance or behavior. Reinforced also was the idea that competency development entailed traditional on-campus classroom instruction, off-campus laboratory experiences, and clinical experiences in both on- and off-campus settings.

8. A concurrent intention was to develop a new major in the undergraduate degree program to prepare students to perform educational services in non-school settings. Not wanting a completely separate, add-on program, we formulated a corollary hypothesis, namely that "generic competencies teachers needed to work effectively with students in grades K-12 are comparable to those needed by educators working in non-school settings." This hypothesis led us to seek a truly generic pedagogical core for all educators, irrespective of their professional practice settings, and to move away from a highly specialized and compartmentalized curriculum. Some interesting insights emerged from this activity. As we defined the competencies needed by teachers in non-school settings, we discovered both duplications and gaps in our existing program for teachers in grades K-12. One such gap, for example, was the underemphasis of the assessment and evaluation area. Several other gaps and numerous duplications also were discovered.

Year Two

IMBUED with the clearer vision of the full potential of the Dean's Grant Project to influence our teacher-education program both immediately and in the long term, we entered the second year of the project with a substantially different approach. Although the prevailing faculty sentiment was still far from whole-hearted support and commitment, a slow and subtle change in attitude toward participation in the project had developed. The Year One bus trip to Nashville undoubtedly had had an influence. Further faculty participation was gained when the College initiated self-study activities to prepare for an upcoming NCATE visit. Several project activities served dual purposes; that is, they provided additional opportunities for faculty members to become more fully informed about various aspects of Public Law 94-142 as well as the NCATE multicultural standard and to explore the implications of both.

The objectives for the project's second year expanded the scope of the initial grant and increased implementation, using staff development and curriculum restructuring as major concepts for bringing about changes. The following seven objectives were adopted for the second year of the Dean's Grant Project:

1. Increase faculty awareness of Public Law 94-142 and the least restrictive environment concept as the two relate to the role and function of higher education teacher-training programs.
2. Provide faculty members with opportunities for staff development in the areas of Public Law 94-142 and the least restrictive environment concept.
3. Provide necessary staff support to the faculty to effect changes in course content according to specific certification areas of elementary, secondary, guidance, administration/supervision, and special education.
4. Provide to the faculty, through an Advisory Council/Leadership Team representing the certification areas, the leadership and charge of effecting course content changes in the certification areas (of #3 above).
5. Provide opportunities for faculty members to participate in cross-disciplinary efforts to effect changes in instructional strategies for handicapped students.
6. Provide a current information flow to faculty members through a college-wide newsletter covering legislative and judicial matters, Dean's Grant activities, faculty participation,

and other Dean's Grants across the United States.

7. Work cooperatively with the Mid-South Teacher Corps Project to provide skills and training for its participants in the areas of Public Law 94-142 and the least restrictive environment concept as they relate to the Teacher Corps Project.

Faculty Related Activities

1. Restructuring of the Advisory/Leadership Team. During the second year the Advisory/Leadership Team reorganized to include the Director of the Teacher Corps Project and faculty representatives from five broad areas of certification (elementary education, secondary education, special education, guidance and counseling, and educational administration and supervision). The specific responsibility of the Leadership Team was to facilitate integration of the least restrictive environment concept with the various certificated preparation programs in the College. This Team assessed needs and designed and carried out staff-development activities to bring about appropriate curriculum changes in the different preparation areas.

2. Conducting College-Wide Staff-Development Sessions. Two sessions were held; they were intended to reach all faculty members in the College.

a. Dr. Dean Corrigan, then Dean of Education at the University of Maryland, presented a series of three siminars on the clarification of definitions and understandings of what the College should be doing relative to Public Law 94-142. He also conducted a special session for the members of the Dean's Grant Leadership Team.

b. Dr. Susan Melnick, Education Program Specialist for the National Teacher Corps, presented a two-day series of seminars on handicapped pupils as part of multicultural education concerns. Dr. Melnick held special sessions for faculty members, including those in the five areas of certification represented on the Leadership Team and the Multicultural Task force, the Director of International Studies, and department chairmen.

3. Scheduling Brown Bag Seminars. Faculty members from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation and the Office of Handicapped Student Services as well as personnel from local school systems conducted lunch-hour seminars that were open to interested faculty members and students. Topics included "Management Concerns for the Mildly Handicapped in the Regular Classroom"; "I.E.P.s" (a simulation); "Due Process"; "The Handicapped Student in Higher Education"; and "Perceptions of Field-Based Practitioners." Public school teachers and administrators attended the last-named seminar to share their concerns with and experiences in trying to implement the concept of "least restrictive environment" for all students.

4. Identification of Additional Priorities. Supplementary technical assistance funds were requested from the National Support Systems Project for the purpose of attending to some urgent needs. They were as follows:

a. To assist department chairmen to carry out more effectively the curricular revisions directed toward Public Law 94-142.

b. To study curricular revisions to insure that the goals in the various program components are well articulated and to plan for the maximum coordination of field experiences for students.

c. To determine how most effectively to use the existing resources of the Leadership Team to assist department chairmen in their implementation respon-

sibilities, and to provide further staff-development assistance.

d. To provide sufficient time to focus completely on the outlined curricular expectations relating to Public Law 94-142 and to coordinate department efforts to effect these expectations as fully as possible.

Our funds did not permit our fulfilling all these needs but they were sufficient to permit addressing the first through a two-day retreat for department chairmen and the Leadership Team. Consultants from the University of Kansas shared their expertise on the implementation of Public Law 94-142 and addressed the questions of competency identification, course-content revision, and evaluation. Faculty members discussed their specific areas of certification. Through this retreat we were reassured that we had already attended to many steps identified as basic to implementation of Public Law 94-142. It was agreed that additional attention should be directed toward (a) assessing the current state of the "least restrictive environment"; (b) obtaining data from graduates on the appropriateness of course work to the provisions of Public Law 94-142; (c) linking university and public school planning; (d) identifying specific competencies and appropriate means of integrating them into courses; (e) defining concrete goals; and (f) establishing a research base for future activities.

5. Creating Faculty Development Awards. The Teacher Corps Project provided the funding for faculty development of instructional modules on both Public Law 94-142 and multicultural education. Five faculty members each received grants of $200 to develop the modules.

6. Strengthening the Resource Center. New materials were acquired and made available through the Center, which had been initiated during Year One, through cooperative efforts with the Teacher Corps Project. A comprehensive bibliography of all resources was compiled with cross-references and annotations for each item.

7. Publication of the Dean's Grant Newsletter. This Newsletter was distributed to all faculty and staff members of the College, the Campus School, and Children's School and to all interested individuals in various departments across campus. A regular feature was the "Dean's Corner." An external researcher noted that this particular column was widely read by all our faculty members.

8. Revisions of Syllabi by Leadership Team. Leadership Team members provided on-going assistance to faculty members in the respective certification areas. Specifically, Team members assessed the receptivity of existing courses to Public Law 94-142 content; identified necessary supportive field experiences; determined current areas of the curriculum that lacked Public Law 94-142 content; defined specific competencies to be incorporated into existing courses; and revised course syllabi to include the competencies identified. These processes resulted in considerable revision of course syllabi to insure curricular accommodation of both Public Law 94-142 and NCATE multicultural standard.

9. Participation in Staff Development for Teacher-Education Institutions. Representatives of the Dean's Grant Project staff, the College faculty, and the Leadership Team participated in a special seminar on Public Law 94-142 that was sponsored by the State Department of Education. Representatives from other teacher-preparation institutions in the state also attended.

10. Providing Leadership for a State Grant. The Project Coordinator was named "Coordinator for Tennessee" to use an AACTE-BEH grant to assist all institutions in revising their curricula according to Public Law 94-142. In cooperation with the other two state institutions with Dean's Grants a special

seminar was held for all teacher-education institutions in Tennessee. The seminar included hands-on experiences in a mini-resource and teaching-materials laboratory. Each participant received a Resource Handbook listing the materials being used by institutions awarded Dean's Grants in the state and elsewhere.

Student-Related Activities

1. Conducting Seminars for Student Teachers. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences co-sponsored Public Law 94-142 awareness and implementation seminars for all student teachers in elementary, secondary, and special education. Seminar topics included "Awareness of Handicapping Conditions"; "Content of Public Law 94-142"; "I.E.P. Development"; and "Simulation Exercises." Pre- and post- tests were administered. Evaluation results showed that the sessions were viewed positively and that students gained additional knowledge and skills related to the law.

2. Survey of Graduate Students. All graduate students enrolled in the College were surveyed to obtain information on their perceptions of the College's effectiveness in preparing them to work with handicapped learners in different settings. The findings were used to provide direction and substance to the faculty's revision of particular course syllabi and, ultimately, to redesign the teacher-preparation program.

3. Providing Seminar for Doctoral Students. Dr. Dean Corrigan conducted a seminar for doctoral students. He discussed various aspects of Public Law 94-142 and the least restrictive environment concept in relation to the practice of education in various settings.

Program-Related Activities

1. Revision of Syllabi in College-Core Courses. Syllabi for courses in the required College core were appropriately revised to include specific competencies needed for the implementation of Public Law 94-142.

2. Revision and Evaluation of Syllabi in Specialization Courses. Appropriate syllabi changes were made in specialized courses in all programs for teachers (K-12), guidance counselors, and school administrators and supervisors. Departments developed plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the changes.

3. Coordination and Planning Among Departments. When course revision needs were identified, similarities in the processes required of teachers to comply with the provisions of Public Law 94-142 and with the NCATE multicultural standard became increasingly apparent. Public Law 94-142 is directed to educating handicapped individuals in the "least restrictive environment" whereas the multicultural standard is directed to building "awareness and accommodation of various kinds of cultural differences," thus both Public Law 94-142 and the multicultural standard are directed to "a sensitivity to individual needs and differences."

4. Field Testing of Modules. The several instructional modules that had been designed to improve the preparation of teachers, guidance counselors, and administrators to function within the context of Public Law 94-142, including the least restrictive environment concept, were field-tested in several courses.

Some Perceptions Following Year Two

THE scope and extent of second-year activities made it difficult for a faculty member in the College to ignore Public Law 94-142, nevertheless we were still far short of full commitment by all faculty members. At the same time, we were well into the process

of course modification and revision. In planning and conducting various activities some significant and far-reaching questions began to be raised:

"What is the best (not necessarily the easiest) way to modify our program to meet both the spirit and letter of Public Law 94-142?"

"Is the basic structure of our teacher-education program an adequate foundation upon which to build new and emerging competencies, expectations, and requirements?"

"If the program foundation is strong enough to permit the addition of competencies that enable teachers to comply with Public Law 94-142, will it hold up under additional strain? Adding the competencies necessary for multicultural education? Adding the competencies mandated by the State Board of Education for teachers in K-8? Adding the requirements relating to reading methodology mandated by the Tennessee Legislature? Making the appropriate response to the Senate-House Joint Resolution that directed a study of ways in which pre-service teacher-education students can acquire more classroom experiences prior to the student-teaching internship?"

The answers to these questions seemed to be a resounding, "No!"

Following discussions, we recognized that we must rebuild and extend the basic core of our teacher-education program. While faculty members continued the analysis of competencies needed by teachers to comply with Public Law 94-142, we reaffirmed the decision made a year earlier to use the Dean's Grant Project as leverage to reconceptualize and restructure our entire undergraduate teacher-education program. We found reinforcement for our earlier belief that teachers of all students, whether handicapped or not, needed both "a sensitivity to individual needs and differences of learners, and the competence to teach students who have different needs and characteristics." Thus, we were highly confident in pushing for further improvement for our overall program.

Year Three

IT was with a strong commitment to improve our entire teacher-education program that we began the third year of the Dean's Grant Project. Our plans for Year Three called for carrying out curriculum and teaching changes deemed necessary to enable our graduates to teach effectively in schools in compliance with Public Law 94-142. Having elected not to add courses to an already fragmented program, we revised existing courses. Testing the hypothesis that "the competencies needed to work effectively with handicapped students were also those needed to work with other students" took considerable time and effort of faculty members, department chairmen, and directors working as a group with the staff of the Dean's office. In the intensive study that ensued, revisions were made by faculty members and the College Undergraduate Curriculum Council and reviewed by consultants.

Our intention to improve our program through reconceptualization and restructure was timely for several reasons. (a) We were obligated to accommodate the principles of Public Law 94-142 and were committed to do our best. (b) Development of a generic base for our teacher-preparation program was clearly in line with the decreasing number of students electing to enter teacher education and the resulting difficulty we and other teacher-preparation institutions were having in maintaining a high degree of diversity and specialization in current programs. We were offering students a choice among more than 30 separate and substantially different specializations, with only four courses common to all programs. We were dividing our students

into classes that were so small they were increasingly difficult to sustain, given our method of funding and the increasing attention being given to class size and credit-hour production per faculty. (c) We believed that we could greatly enhance the quality of our teacher-preparation program by identifying those areas of knowledge and skill that were absolutely essential to all professional educators and developing, through program restructuring, a well-articulated program for the delivery of these generic competencies. (d) We believed that the reconceptualized generic component we were striving for not only would be a better and more effective model for preparing K-12 teachers but, also, would provide the opportunity for the College to extend its mission to educators practicing or intending to practice in non-school settings.

Specific objectives for the third year of the Dean's Grant were as follows:

1. To carry out curricular changes in courses directly related to areas of initial pre-service certification.
2. To institute field-based experiences to provide students with practical settings in which to apply the skills they acquired as a result of curricular changes.
3. To continue making appropriate curricular changes in courses that support the initial certification areas.
4. To evaluate curricular changes made in Year Two and make appropriate revisions.
5. To continue updating the Resource Center with appropriate materials to support activities and expand usage of the Center by all students.
6. To continue the Dean's Grant Project Newsletter to effectively communicate with faculty members in the College of Education.
7. To continue to work cooperatively with the Teacher Corps Project to influence participants' attitudes toward and skills in dealing with the "least restrictive environment" concept.
8. To identify and acquire existing curricular resources that complement and enrich the efforts to carry out the changes in course content.
9. To develop needed instructional support materials and resources to achieve the most effective results in enabling students to acquire skills necessary for implementing the "least restrictive environment" concept.
10. To continue to provide extended faculty leadership to assure the appropriate development of curricular changes in course content and to assure adherence to an interdisciplinary approach to the "least restrictive environment" concept.
11. To identify and use, cooperatively, local education agency personnel to enhance field-based experience in implementing the "least restrictive environment" concept.

Faculty-Related Activities

1. Providing College-Wide Staff Development. Two days of meetings and seminars were held on campus with Dr. Maynard Reynolds, Director of the National Support Systems Project. Individual meetings were held with the Leadership Team, faculty members who taught methods courses, the total college faculty, graduate students, and department chairmen.

2. Extension of Brown Bag Seminars. Six brown bag seminars were held, two for college-wide personnel and four for individual departments. Two were held by departments at off-campus sites where handicapped students were being educated.

3. Participation in Staff Development in Other Higher Education Institutions. An institutional team participated in a

State Department of Education Conference for higher education institutions. Opportunity was afforded to exchange ideas with other education faculty members from across the state. There was considerable interest in helping one another to do the best job possible of building the provisions of Public Law 94-142 into basic professional preparation programs.

4. Conducting Pilot Project in Student-Teaching Semester. This project was initiated by two faculty members (one from Curriculum and Instruction and one from Special Education and Rehabilitation) to facilitate communication between regular and special education teachers on the academic goals of children participating in their programs. Other participants included two student teachers, a fifth-grade public school teacher, and a resource teacher.

5. Expanded Distribution of Newsletter. The monthly Dean's Grant Project Newsletter was continued; it was distributed to the 36 colleges and universities that were members of the Tennessee Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (TACTE) to assist them in incorporating the principles of Public Law 94-142 in their teacher-education programs.

6. Developing Liaison with Local Teachers and Principals. Faculty members identified local school personnel who could enhance students' field-based experiences with the "least restrictive environment" concept.

7. Presentations to Professional Groups. Presentations on the Dean's Grant Project were made at several national and regional meetings and at meetings of the Tennessee Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. Materials developed through our Project were shared with other teacher educators in the state.

8. Development of State-Wide Assistance Network. In cooperation with the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, a state-wide assistance network was established among the state's 36 teacher-preparation institutions. Its purpose was to share problems that arose while building Public Law 94-142 concepts into teacher-education programs and to determine how the institutions could help each other.

Program-Related Activities

1. Use of Resource Center. Resource Center holdings were expanded. Retrieval files were set up to promote use of the resources by faculty members. Much of this expansion was made possible through cooperation with the Teacher Corps Project. Efforts were made to link resources with courses to bring about greater use.

2. Modules Shared and Used in Courses. Modules developed during Year Two under the Faculty Development Award Project were evaluated, refined, and made available for general use by the College faculty and faculty members of other Tennessee teacher-education programs.

3. Streamlining the Basic Professional Education Components. A series of developments took place to improve the core components of the undergraduate teacher-education programs.

a. The Dean shared with the faculty the need for greater "cost effectiveness measures" and illustrated how the generic program revisions being made to incorporate the concepts of Public Law 94-142 helped in these efforts.

b. The chairmen, directors, and professional staff in the Dean's office, through a series of extended meetings, reached several working agreements on program structure and contents. They were intended to be tentative, to encourage the inclusion in our program of courses and experiences that would enable all our graduates to work effectively with handi-

capped learners in the least restrictive environment. These working agreements were as follows:

(1) The undergraduate program should assume that student-learning results are variable and hierarchical and range from low to high order, not unlike Bloom's taxonomy of learning results. The group used a descriptive scale that included the following four levels of learning:

Level I:
Knowledge - the student will be able to recognize concepts by defining, describing, naming, and identifying them.

Level II:
Understanding/Conceptualization (Requires Analysis of Concepts and Alternatives) - the student will be able to determine causes, motives, and strengths and limitations; analyze evidence; present alternatives; reach conclusions; support statements and conclusions; and compare and interpret ideas.

Level III:
Application/Demonstration/Skill - the student should be able to demonstrate mastery of knowledge and understanding gained by means such as using simulations; making presentations; using multimedia; delivery in field settings; and interacting effectively.

Level IV:
Synthesis/Evaluation - the student will be able to predict, judge, assess, discuss implications and express opinions (agreements/disagreements).

(2) The program should have a phasing or sequencing dimension. The group considered four sequential and interrelated phases that might provide the base for conceptualizing the program. They were as follows:

Phase I. Orientation and Introduction to the Profession - e.g., the magnitude, variety, and diversity of the educational enterprise; the magnitude, variety, and diversity of educational roles in American society; and the tentative identification by students of career goals (a written exercise that could be used also as an examination).

Phase II. Learners and Learning - e.g., characteristics of learners, young and old, handicapped and nonhandicapped, rural and urban, etc.; and factors and conditions that affect the learning process.

Phase III. Pedagogy (learning about teaching, curriculum, evaluation, and learning resources) - envisioned as five dimensions: curriculum, assessment of learning, instructional models and strategies, management of the learning environment, and resource materials.

Phase IV. Professionalization - envisioned as having three distinct parts: internships/practica; a relatively sophisticated study of the profession, its history, various philosophical foundations, and roles expected of various philosophical foundations, and roles

expected of various members of the total education enterprise; and an exit "professional paper" that would contain an analysis and synthesis of the student's previous learning and its relation to his/her elected career plans, immediate and long range.

(3) Within the contexts of the phases, broad areas of competencies were to be identified and expected of students as a condition of graduation and licensure. Hours and hours were spent in considering and identifying those competencies that should be expected of all teacher-education graduates. The full development of these competencies was to be shared by the teacher-education faculty in the College.

There was, at that point, substantial agreement that at least eight broad categories or clusters of competencies should be included. The group relied heavily on competency listings available in the literature, and about 8-10 such listings were studied in depth. Our version of "the wheel" (i.e., the generic competency clusters) was tentatively described as follows:

(a) Communications and Human Relation Skills
(b) Cultural/Ideological Dimensions of Teaching
(c) Understanding and Modifying Human Behavior
(d) Curriculum Planning
(e) Instructional Strategies and Skills
(f) Instructional Resources
(g) Measurement and Evaluation
(h) Professional Characteristics and Experiences

4. Determination of Field Experiences. A definition of field experiences consistent with the principles of Public Law 94-142 was developed, and required field experiences were identified and incorporated in core courses in all certification areas. They included not only K-12 areas of certification but, also, areas of counseling, reading, and the principalship and instructional supervision.

5. Validation of Curricular Changes. Curricular changes made in course syllabi during Year Two were adopted. Competencies were reviewed by faculty members in various committees and revised as needed.

6. Development of Draft Proposal Through Doctoral Seminar. Generic competencies for which reasonable faculty consensus was attained were compiled through a specially designed doctoral-level curriculum-development seminar; it was conducted jointly by a highly interested department chairman and the Associate Dean (Project Coordinator). These competencies were grouped, extended, and placed within course structures. A preliminary set of considerations were identified for transforming the courses into a programmatic configuration.

7. Dissemination to Other Teacher-Education Programs. Learning modules and resource lists that were developed through the Project were shared with other colleges and universities in the state.

Student-Related Activities

1. Conducting Graduate Student Seminars. A graduate student seminar was conducted by Dr. Maynard Reynolds on the subject of "School of the Future."

2. Participation in "Handicapped Awareness Week." The Dean's Grant Project co-sponsored "Handicapped Awareness Week" with Handicapped Student Services. A panel discussion, open to everyone at the university, was held with handicapped students. Ideas were shared on ways in which teachers needed to work with handicapped students.

3. Provision of Student-Teaching Seminars. Seminars for student teachers which dealt with teaching handicapped students in the mainstreamed classroom were further developed and held for all student teachers.

Some Perceptions After Year Three

AT the conclusion of Year Three, we were optimistic that we would accomplish our goal of substantially revising and improving the basic components of our professional preparation program. Extensive participation by and suggestions from faculty members and administrators had occurred on a continuing basis for more than a year. Many excellent ideas were afloat and considerable agreement existed on the goals and program characteristics desired. The amount of work accomplished on various aspects of the project was overwhelming and gratifying. Students and faculty members who participated in the doctoral seminar had brought some components together in a workable format. Even so, it was obvious that the entire summer would have to be devoted to further refinement in order to present a draft proposal to the entire faculty for preliminary review in the fall of 1981.

It was ironic that just when the College had arrived at a highly significant juncture in the development process the Dean's Grant Project as a formal, federally supported effort, was over. We regretted that funding would not be continued for another cycle. We had had three good years with the project. A number of changes in faculty responsiveness and course content and purpose could be attributed directly to the work carried on through the project. Other outcomes could be cited as well, the major one being the decision made about midway through the Grant that a thorough restructuring of the undergraduate program in teacher education must be our ultimate goal, eliminating the need to "add on" courses and experiences to prepare students to become effective teachers in classrooms containing diverse populations of pupils. That was the reason for the 18 months of concerted efforts to develop a basic framework for restructuring our total program for the preparation of teachers.

Overall Results: Current and Projected

EVEN without second-cycle funding of the Dean's Grant Project, the faculty and administration were committed to the concepts developed through the project. Specifically, the following activities were extended into the 1981-82 school year:

1. Continued development and operation of the Resource Room that contained materials related to Public Law 94-142.
2. Completion of the final phases of the revised undergraduate teacher-education program and the inclusion of generic competencies that had been developed through the Dean's Grant Project.
3. Continued publication of the college-wide Newsletter as a means of maintaining good communications, a factor of great importance as we moved into the reaction/modification phase of the program restructuring. Because the Dean's Grant Project Newsletter served us well during the life of that project, and because we were continuing the essence of the project in terms of content and purpose, it seemed both logical and wise to continue publishing the Newsletter.

It should be pointed out that prior to the start of the Dean's Grant Project, the College had completed an extensive "Five Year Goals Study." One goal was to extend the mission of the College by meeting the preparation needs of educators who practice in non-school settings. As indicated earlier, this goal re-emerged in full force during the second year of the Dean's Grant Project. When we considered ways to better identify and carry out a generic core of professional studies for certificated teachers, K-12, it became apparent that all educators, irrespective of professional practice setting, had some needs in common. Thus, the development of a professional preparation program for educators in non-school settings proceeded simultaneously with the revisions being undertaken through the Dean's Grant Project. The program for non-school educators was conceived and structured as an "Educational Services" major within the existing B.S.E. degree in the College. Thus, by the end of the Dean's Grant Project, the decision already had been made to move ahead with both the new and redesigned programs.

The summer following the conclusion of the Dean's Grant Project was spent completing the development and refinement of the two new program proposals. When faculty members returned in late August 1981 for the start of the Fall Semester, they found in their mailboxes several hundred pages of reading materials under the following titles: A Proposal for Changing the Professional Education Components in the Undergraduate Teacher-Education Programs, and Proposal for the Initiation of new Major in Educational Services within the Bachelor of Science in Education Degree. The entire first faculty meeting of the academic year was devoted to a presentation of these two proposals. Faculty members soon were fully apprised of what lay ahead.

Meanwhile, at the time of this writing, about 70 faculty members are completing final development of the core courses for the revised K-12 teacher-preparation program. Faculty committees will complete descriptions of other areas of the proposal this summer (1982), including such components as advising, competency verification, development of clinical laboratory resources, identification of appropriate laboratory school sites for field experiences, screening of teaching faculty for core courses, and other related concerns. Simultaneously, department faculties are reviewing and revising requirements in the various teaching-endorsement areas, giving particular attention to requirements in specialized professional education courses that support these endorsement areas.

The proposal is expected to be presented to the College Undergraduate Curriculum Council in early Fall 1982, and by January 1983, approval at the University level should be gained. Following a vigorous and comprehensive program of staff-development activities, both new programs will be undertaken in the Fall of 1983. It is very doubtful that either could have been developed without the benefits of the three-year Dean's Grant Project.

Dean's Grant Projects: A Vehicle for Faculty Development

Bob G. Woods

University of Missouri-Columbia

ABSTRACT: Many Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) have focused on faculty-development activities to provide teacher educators with the competencies needed to prepare pre-service teachers for teaching handicapped children and youth in regular classrooms. Although different approaches are used, the overall strategy of most DGPs is to move from developing faculty awareness of the purposes and implications of Public Law 94-142 to facilitating changes in the teacher-education curriculum to prepare students to practice their profession according to the law's principles. Descriptions of how some projects have carried out this strategy are presented.

MUCH attention has been devoted to faculty development in recent years, in both the professional literature and actual practice. Prior to the advent of the Dean's Grant program, however, most of the attention was directed toward elementary and secondary school personnel rather than teacher educators. Anyone who has been affiliated with a department, school, or college of education (SCDE) is fully cognizant of the problems in initiating an effective faculty-development program. The deterrents range from lethargy to the belief that such programs infringe upon academic freedom. Perhaps the main inhibiting factor in most teacher-education programs has been the lack of funds to provide essential resources, such as consultants, instructional materials, support staff, and faculty time. This problem was solved for the institutions that were successful in obtaining Deans' Grants.

In order to facilitate the implementation of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children's Act, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (now the Office of Special

---

Dr. Woods is Professor, Dean, and Director of the Dean's Grant Project, College of Education.

SP 023 248

Education and Rehabilitation, U.S. Department of Education) initiated the Dean's Grant program. Its purpose was to bring about the needed changes in pre-service teacher-education programs to prepare teachers to understand and comply with the law's principles. It was an innovative and effective measure to assure the provision of educational opportunities for handicapped children and youth who are placed in regular classrooms. Because of the dwindling resources of institutions of higher education, opportunities for faculty development relating to Public Law 94-142 would have been extremely limited without the DGPs. In short, the Dean's Grant Projects provide resources to SCDEs to tool up for Public Law 94-142, a task for which they had a need and an obligation.

The Need for Faculty Development in SCDEs

MANY factors in addition to the enactment of Public Law 94-142 have contributed to the need for programs of faculty development in teacher-education divisions. One is the phenomenon referred to as the "graying of the campus." Given the diminishing number of college students electing to enter teacher-education programs, many institutions eliminated faculty positions in SCDEs. The absence of "new blood" means that each year teacher-education faculties are growing older and probably more obsolescent. It is estimated that the modal group of tenured professors will rise from 36-45 years of age in 1980 and to 56-65 years in the year 2000 (Heideman, 1981).

Other factors which have contributed to the urgency of inservice education programs on campuses are the introduction of new technology, such as microcomputers, changing social conditions that have given rise to the need for multicultural and bilingual education, legislation at both state and national levels, and the development of new knowledge in most academic fields. The need for teacher educators to keep abreast of new knowledge, technology, and trends in their areas of specialization is imperative; otherwise practicing elementary and secondary school teachers will out-pace them. The Dean's Grant Projects, therefore, although directed toward the effective implementation of Public Law 94-142, have provided the spark that has set off a multifaceted set of faculty-development programs in many institutions.

A virtue of the DGPs has been the relative freedom of design which has permitted each institution to plan a program to fit its particular set of circumstances. Some institutions have focused their DGP activities on curricular revision, some have undertaken the development of instructional materials, and others have attended primarily to faculty development. Regardless of the primary focus, however, all have included an element of inservice education which has resulted in faculty development.

A major difficulty in establishing a successful faculty-development program in institutions of higher education is overcoming the tendency of professors to believe that it is probably needed by most of one's colleagues but not by oneself. Administrators also are prone to urge faculty members to engage in faculty-development programs but to avoid participation themselves. The Dean's Grant Projects were designed to avoid this pitfall: the dean or director of the teacher-education unit was expected and, indeed, required to become the principal investigator.

Models for Faculty Development

If the goal of a faculty-development program is improved educational opportunities for students, the program must be carefully planned. A loosely connected series of faculty workshops, discussion groups, or presentations by consultants may be interest-

ing but they probably will not result in curricular or instructional improvement. The more successful faculty-development programs are organized into stages or phases, and this organization has been followed by most Dean's Grant Projects.

A model incorporating five identifiable and related stages was described as follows (Wood, Thompson, & Russell, 1981):

> Stage I, Readiness, emphasizes selection and understanding of and commitment to new professional behaviors by a school staff or group of educators. In Stage II, Planning, the specific plans for an inservice program are developed to achieve the desired changes in professional practice selected in Stage I. In the Training Stage, Stage III, the plans are translated into practice. The Implementation Stage, Stage IV, focuses on ensuring that the training becomes part of the ongoing professional behavior of teachers and administrators in their own work setting. Stage V, Maintenance, begins as new behaviors are integrated into daily practice. The aim of this final stage is to ensure that once a change in performance is operational, it will continue over time. (p. 64)

Another model is based on the assumption that significant improvements in instruction must take place at three levels: attitude, process, and structure (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975). Relating this model to DGPs, the inference is that faculty members must be attitudinally supportive of a program of faculty development for instructional programs to be improved or strategies focusing on the process of instruction will be relatively ineffective. Once a faculty member has become attuned attitudinally to a new concept, program, or innovation and has developed a repertoire of methods and techniques for transmitting the knowledge of it, the organizational structure must provide essential supports for the program to succeed.

In this discussion the process of faculty development is viewed as consisting of three phases: awareness, training and/or preparation, and adoption. Because of the relative newness of Public Law 94-142 and the concept of "mainstreaming" which it supports, developing an awareness of the law's provisions and incorporating them in courses was particularly important for the first cycle of DGPs. However, because of the publicity and attention that the law received during the two or three years following its enactment, developing the awareness of faculty members through recent Dean's Grant Projects requires less effort.

Awareness Development

BASIC to any successful effort to develop awareness is the dissemination of pertinent information. Dean's Grant Projects were no exception. A sizable body of literature on meeting the needs of handicapped children and youth in regular classrooms was available from the beginning; it needed only to be brought to the attention of teacher educators.

During the beginning stage of the DGP at the University of Missouri-Columbia (UMC), faculty-development activities concentrated on disseminating information on Public Law 94-142 and the concept of instructing handicapped students in the least restrictive environment (see Grosenick & Woods, 1978). These initial activities could be described as <u>information saturation</u>. A number of strategies were used to develop awareness among the fac-

ulty members of interest, including the distribution of packets of duplicated articles, reports, and a bibliography of books and other types of materials that were available in the professional library section of the College's Instructional Materials Center. Other types of scheduled activities were special seminars for the faculty, a project newsletter, a filmstrip presentation on Public Law 94-142, and two faculty retreats focusing on appropriate content. The project coordinator, an established and respected member of the Department of Special Education, conferred with both individual faculty members and small groups to discuss the law and its implications for teachers in elementary and secondary schools. In these conferences a concerted effort was made to alleviate the idea that the Dean's Grant Project was another grant for the special education faculty.

A project advisory committee with representatives from different departments was established early to suggest and assist with carrying out various strategies. An effort was made to appoint faculty members to serve on the advisory committee who were interested in and supportive of the DGP and who could obtain the support of colleagues.

Faculty Training

BY the beginning of the second year of the UMC project, some faculty-development activities were designed to encompass both awareness and training elements. Among the activities were presentations by consultants on such topics as identification of various types of handicapping conditions, formulating individualized education plans (IEPs), due process, and other concepts. Other activities were panel discussions that included regular classroom teachers and educational resource teachers from mainstreamed elementary and secondary schools, and the development of a list of competencies required by teachers who work with handicapped students in regular classrooms.

The development of the list of competencies became a major activity of the DGP during its second year of operation. A long list of nearly 200 competencies was compiled from various sources. Two groups of faculty members--one made up of special education teacher educators and the other of regular teacher educators--rated the competencies on a five-point scale for relevance to teaching handicapped children in regular classrooms. After many inservice education meetings, much discussion, and the use of a type of Q-sort procedure, the list was pared to 45 "critical competencies."

When consensus was reached on the competencies needed by teachers to work successfully with handicapped students in regular classrooms, the next faculty inservice activity was to conduct a needs assessment to determine if and in which courses the different competencies were being addressed. Faculty committees examined all undergraduate courses, including those in such specialized areas as home economics, industrial arts, physical education, early childhood education, and so on. The objective was to determine the current coverage of the critical competencies and to make the necessary adjustments so that all teacher-education majors would be able to develop them during their undergraduate programs. Decisions were then made on which courses would devote attention to the various competencies. Although no directives were issued, the charge by inference was that specified competencies would be addressed in certain courses.

"Firing the Gun"

NEAR the end of the second year of the UMC Dean's Grant Project, the director and coordinator struggled with evaluating the pro-

gress of the project. Fortunately, Dr. Gene E. Hall agreed to use his Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) to assess the effectiveness of the project in producing change.

CBAM, briefly, is a means of viewing the change process in formal organizations according to seven Stages of Concern about the Innovation and eight Levels of Use of the Innovation (Hall, 1978). Data are gathered through questionnaires and interviews. The evaluator is able to ascertain the stage of concern and level of use attained by the individual or, when plotted together, the group. By analyzing the data, the change facilitator works in a diagnostic and prescriptive mode. His or her role becomes one of determining which resources to use and when to intervene.

The major goal of the UMC Dean's Grant Project during its early phase was to develop awareness of and interest in the concept of providing handicapped students with educational opportunities in the least restrictive environment. During this information-saturation phase, a variety of activities were scheduled and numerous opportunities were made for faculty and administrative staff members to become involved in faculty development.

Dr. Hall's charting and analysis of the data collected with the CBAM instrument clearly showed that UMC College of Education faculty members were generally knowledgeable about and interested in the innovation but that many were "nonusers." In his briefing to the project director and coordinator, Dr. Hall explained that the faculty members had become fully aware of the concept of mainstreaming and genuinely concerned about it. The information saturation obviously had been effective, nevertheless many faculty members had not incorporated mainstreaming concepts into their teaching. Relating the UMC Dean's Grant Project to other college faculties that tried to institutionalize innovative programs, Dr. Hall explained that unless something further was done by the project leadership, continued progress would be unlikely, and the faculty members who had begun to be users likely would regress to the nonuse level. According to his analysis, the time was right for "firing the gun," that is, "Nothing further is going to happen unless you pull the trigger," he told the project director and coordinator.

Following Dr. Hall's visit, a meeting of the Advisory Committee was called to explore what the next steps should be to incorporate mainstreaming concepts and teaching strategies into the undergraduate curricula. At this point, the focus of the project was shifted from the awareness and training stages to adoption.

Adoption

CONSIDERABLE thought and much deliberation were devoted to methods of "firing the gun," and several strategies were planned and used to give impetus to the adoption stage of the faculty-development project. One of the more successful methods was to select a facilitator in each of the five departments in the undergraduate teacher-education programs. Faculty members who had demonstrated a knowledge of and interest in DGP goals were selected to stimulate interest in the project and to assist faculty members with incorporating appropriate content and instructional activities into their courses. A very important factor in the success of this strategy was making available a small amount of money to each facilitator to use as he or she deemed appropriate for the attainment of the project's goals. The money was obtained by putting a portion of the facilitators' salaries on the grant and reallocating the savings for their use in promoting faculty development in their respective departments.

The facilitators used their discretionary funds in various ways ranging from hiring a graduate assistant to paying travel expenses to attend selected workshops and professional meetings; funds were used, for example, to purchase instructional materials and to pay consultant fees, secretarial assistance, and departmental faculty retreats.

Naming facilitators who represented the various departments and making discretionary resources available to them were important factors in the success of the adoption stage. It was an effective way to develop a feeling of greater ownership in the Dean's Grant Project by the regular teacher educators. It was at this point of the project that faculty members seriously began to examine how their courses could be modified to incorporate subject content and instructional activities appropriate to the implementation of Public Law 94-142 in elementary and secondary schools.

Needless to say, the success of a faculty-development program, particularly at the adoption stage, depends upon the institutional environment. Innovations and constructive changes do not occur without administrative support and without the necessary conditions to set them in motion. The program must provide for individual interests and strengths. The reward system of the school, college, or department of education also is an important factor in the success of a faculty-development program. If good teaching is not rewarded, then faculty members will be reluctant to expend the required time and effort to revise their courses and improve the quality of their teaching. It is human nature to emphasize activities that are rewarded.

DGP Models for Faculty Development

A number of faculty-development models have been designed for and followed by the Dean's Grant Projects. Some have focused on a particular segment of SCDE faculty members whereas others have included all or virtually all the members of the teacher-education faculty, including those who prepare school counselors and administrators. Some projects have cut across faculties of arts and sciences in addition to education. A few projects have incorporated interinstitutional components which include activities that project the benefits to several institutions in the region or state. Another model which has become increasingly prominent during the past two or three years is the forming of a consortium under one DGP by three or more colleges or universities. Some descriptions of various models of DGPs or, in some cases, of a component of a specific DGP, follow.

North Carolina State University-Raleigh

The DGP at the School of Education, North Carolina State University-Raleigh, uses a unique approach to faculty development. Ann L. Stewart, Project Coordinator, provided the following description:

> The major strategy for planning specific activities to support faculty efforts of preparing professionals to educate handicapped pupils at NCSU is Technical Assistance Agreements (TAAs). They are written contracts negotiated between a faculty member or group and the project coordinator and approved by the dean. New departments are focused on each year.
>
> The TAAs are supported by flexible project funding that allows the individual faculty member, program area, or entire department to develop a plan to meet a specific need. Specific criteria are used

to rate the TAAs and ascertain appropriate funding. The format includes objectives, costs, time-lines, documentation, description, feasibility, and target population. Each TAA must include its own methods for evaluation or documentation and should result in a tangible end product.

A variety of TAAs in the Departments of Occupational Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Counselor Education have been submitted over the past two years. Grant monies have funded travel, workshops, retreats, research, module development, guest speakers, purchase of materials, graduate and clerical assistance, and other activities to facilitate faculty projects.

An interdepartmental TAA funded two workshops at which faculty members discussed shared responsibility among general and special teacher educators and counselor educators as a means of furthering the preparation of teachers and counselors to meet the needs of students with special needs. They discussed possible target groups, available resources, various units to team teach, the expansion of a unit on special students for a counselor education course, and the formation of three-member teams to develop specific delivery systems. The Dean's Grant Project provided monetary support for the workshops and materials for the instructional unit.

One social studies professor contracted to study problems faced by secondary level social studies teachers in mainstreamed classrooms and to seek alternative solutions to the questions raised. He surveyed a sample of 350 teachers nation-wide, compiled a list of questions and issues raised, and is consulting with experts in the field to determine appropriate responses. His study should result in a publication that will affect the methods and materials courses at NCSU and elsewhere.

Examples of other projects that have been funded include a case study and report, "How Middle Schools Accommodate the Handicapped," a research study, "The Needs of Secondary Level Special Educators for Training in the Content Areas," and the development of a new elective course, "Teaching the Handicapped in Mainstreamed Classrooms."

Colorado State University

The pre-service teacher-preparation program at the College of Professional Studies, Colorado State University, carries the major responsibility for undergraduate training programs for secondary teachers in academic, vocational, industrial science, career, and physical education programs. A major component of the Dean's Grant Project, which is in its fourth year, has been faculty development. All 87 faculty members in the College of Professional Studies participate in the curriculum sequence of the pre-service teacher-education program and are included in the target group for faculty development. Heavy emphasis has been placed on activities to enable faculty members to become proficient in teaching secondary school teachers the necessary competencies for meeting the educational needs of handicapped students in regular classrooms. The competencies have been grouped into the following 11 categories:

1. Knowledge of Legislation
2. Knowledge of Nature of Handicapping Conditions
3. Awareness of Own Attitudes toward Handicapped Pupils and Development of Positive Attitudes
4. Communicating with Parents of Handicapped Pupils
5. Knowledge of Appropriate Environmental Settings for Handicapped Pupils
6. Adaptation of Curriculum Content and Supporting Materials
7. Classroom Management Skills and Group Process Techniques
8. Diagnostic Teaching Techniques
9. Evaluating Student Progress
10. Design and Use of IEPs
11. Communication Skills with Special Education Resource Personnel Including Use of Resource Rooms

Various activities have been used to attain the objectives of the faculty-development component of the DGP. They include visiting other DGPs that focus on preparing secondary school teachers, attending workshops on the content and skills needed to teach the competencies, producing videotapes of mock staffings, researching module development, and interacting with the handicapped community.

A new model of secondary teacher preparation is in the process of development by the Dean's Grant Project at Colorado State University. The project leaders intend to share the results of their project with other teacher-preparation institutions throughout Colorado and the nation.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Project M.A.S.H. (Multidisciplinary Approach to Serving the Handicapped), California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, is an example of a DGP that is designed to provide inservice training for an entire university faculty. According to Dr. Ellen Curtis-Pierce, Project Coordinator, the major purpose of Project M.A.S.H. is to contribute positively to the development and lifestyle of handicapped individuals by improving the university's personnel preparation programs across all disciplines (Business Administration, Arts, Agriculture, Engineering, Science, and Environmental Design). Initially, the project focused on generating among all faculty members of the university an awareness of the characteristics, special needs, and rights of handicapped individuals. The project has three major goals: (a) to increase the awareness and sensitivity of university faculty members in the different disciplines to the needs of handicapped individuals, (b) to expand the knowledge and enhance the skills and competencies of university faculty members in the different disciplines with respect to serving the handicapped population, and (c) to assist university faculty members in upgrading existing curricula to reflect a concern for handicapped individuals.

Several significant accomplishments marked the project's initial year. A Fall Convocation and "Handicapped Awareness Day" were successful awareness programs and were conducted for all university faculty members. The Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance initiated the process of revising its entire curriculum; community support groups were identified and employed in an advisory capacity; and a number of faculty orientations, presentations, and workshops were conducted by con-

sultants and the project staff.

The thrust of the second year has been on a continuation of awareness programs and the initiation of inservice training programs in all the schools on campus. The project coordinator is working with a group of selected faculty members from all schools on campus to help them to revise their courses to include appropriate concepts of handicapped individuals. Incentives were established by the project staff to encourage faculty members to participate in project activities and to revise their courses. The incentives included travel to professional meetings, workshops, or conferences to acquire knowledge or skills related to Project M.A.S.H. goals; assignment of project assistants; and recognition through the University Information Dissemination network.

An instructor in the Department of Urban Planning, School of Environmental Design, conducted an interesting activity during the second year of the project. Forty Urban Planning students who are in training to become urban designers were given a forceful lesson on how the world is experienced by people with limited mobility when they spent a day in wheelchairs. As they made their way across campus, the students found their familiar routes blocked by stairs or by doors that were too heavy to open. According to the instructor, this activity, in which the design students temporarily experienced problems of access to building facilities which are common to handicapped people, gave the students a new perspective on design problems.

The Director of Project M.A.S.H. is Dr. Paul F. Weller, Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University. Having a person at this level of the university's administrative structure serve as project director undoubtedly has been an important factor in the success of this unusual DGP, which is directed to all members of the faculties of the different schools.

University of Missouri-Columbia

Since 1977 the University of Missouri-Columbia DGP has had an interinstitutional component focusing on faculty development. The format generally has provided for five to eight Missouri colleges and universities to cooperate on a series of four two-day workshops emphasizing faculty development activities on teaching handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. Three faculty members from the SCDEs of the participating institutions were invited to take part in the series of workshops which were scheduled throughout the academic year. Each participating institution was asked to identify two faculty members to represent the areas of elementary education and secondary education, respectively, and one faculty member to represent educational foundations, physical education, or another area of teacher education.

Arrangements were made to hold the workshops at a local hotel or motel, and the participants were reimbursed for their travel expenses. Outside consultants were brought in for some workshops. Among the consultants were elementary and secondary school teachers, professors of special education, handicapped people, and personnel from the state education agency. On some occasions, participants from the cooperating colleges who possessed expertise on the topic at hand made a presentation and led the discussion.

During the current year the thrust of the DGP has been directed toward two other areas of specialization: school administration and school counseling. A two-day workshop was held to identify the competencies needed by each professional group to

practice with full regard for the provisions of Public Law 94-142 in elementary and secondary schools. A professor in each field was invited from every college or university in Missouri that offers graduate programs in school administration and school counseling. Following a process of validating the competencies during the current year, another workshop is projected for next year which will focus on the curricular implications of the competencies. This series of inservice activities should result in improved instructional programs for the preparation of school principals and counselors who will be directly concerned with Public Law 94-142. In order for classroom teachers to attain optimum effectiveness in working with handicapped students in regular classrooms, the cooperation and support of knowledgeable principals and counselors are essential.

Oklahoma State University

Staff development for the Oklahoma State University's teacher-education faculty was the primary goal of a three-year Dean's Grant Project focusing on "Meeting the Education Needs of the Handicapped." The major premise of the program was that the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward Public Law 94-142 and the concept of mainstreaming are influenced by the attitudes of teacher-education faculty members with whom they came in contact during their pre-service training. The following description of this DGP was provided by Darrell Ray and Imogene Land, Project Coordinators, and Dean Donald Robinson, Project Director.

> Because the development of positive attitudes toward mainstreaming was of paramount interest, the staff-development program grew to include the broadest representation of and participation possible from faculties in Special Education, Elementary Education, Psychology, Secondary Education, discipline departments, undergraduate and graduate students, public school teachers and administrators and parents. Out of this group there developed an interdisciplinary advisory committee for the Dean's Project (DPAC). The DPAC then participated in the development of activities to be pursued throughout the duration of the program.
>
> In order to determine levels of knowledge and need in the area of educating handicapped children and youth, a survey of faculty members and graduate assistants was conducted in the College of Education in 1978-79. This survey revealed the following.
>
> 1. Slightly over one-half (51.6%) of the 64 respondents did not cover Public Law 94-142 in their courses.
> 2. Forty-nine respondents (76.5%) devoted little or no time to Public Law 94-142 in their courses.
> 3. Approximately half (51.6%) had never personally observed mainstreaming of handicapped students in regular classrooms.
>
> The major thrust of this staff-development program was to foster faculty members' knowledge in preparing teacher interns to meet the educational needs of handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. The actual program design had four components: (a) awareness workshops for all faculty members and teaching assistants, (b) working retreats for faculty members and staff, (c) colloquia for teacher-education faculty members, and (d) academic classes for

faculty members. The latter component grew out of faculty-identified needs for more formal, structured interactions with professionals in related disciplines. A brief description of each component follows:

Awareness Workshops for Faculty Members and Teaching Assistants. Awareness workshops were held during the fall semester each year. Each workshop was interdisciplinary and was attended by all faculty members and teaching assistants in the College of Education, as well as selected faculty members and teaching assistants from those departments outside the College which affect regular teacher-education programs. The workshops were designed to introduce faculty members to the concepts of mainstreaming and information on the educational needs of handicapped students.

Working Retreats for Faculty Members and Staff. Retreats for faculty members, staff, and DPAC members were held to discuss the following areas of concern: (a) the status of handicapped learners in classrooms, (b) implications for practice developed through case law relating to Public Law 94-142, (c) the classroom teacher's role in mainstreaming, and (d) a model for revising teacher-education curriculum to meet the challenge of preparing professional educators. These topics were later used, with modification, in retreats devoted exclusively to elementary education (January 1980), special eudcation (January 1980), secondary education (May 1980), occupational and adult education (May 1980), teacher-education personnel from other colleges (May 1980), faculty from other Oklahoma universities (September 1980), and special certification programs, such as reading, counseling, school psychology, etc. (November 1980).

Colloquia for Teacher-Education Faculty Members. This highly successful series of formal and informal presentations was the impetus for discussions of current issues in the education of handicapped children and youth. Presentations included "Adapting Educational Facilities to Meet the Needs of Handicapped Students," "Nonbiased Assessment," "Multicultural Approach to Mainstreaming: A Challenge to Counselors, Teachers, and Psychologists," "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers," "Conversations with Exceptional Adults," "The Teacher's Involvement in Counseling Parents with Handicapped Students," "Toward a Curriculum of Individual Difference: Mainstreaming in Elementary Teacher Education," and many others.

Academic Classes for Faculty Members in Teacher Education. A total of 36 faculty members, representing teacher educators in six departments from three colleges of the university, participated in classes on broadening the knowledge base for educating handicapped children and youth and to provide continuing professional dialogue of related issues.

The retreats, seminars, colloquia, and classes stimulated questions, debates, and discussions in which diverse opinions were encouraged. Throughout, therefore, emphasis was as much on process and the institutionalization of a system for program review and revision which emphasized dialogue across disciplines as on the product, inasmuch as the latter is

viewed as dynamic and ever-changing.

George Mason University

The Dean's Grant Project at George Mason University (GMU) includes 55 faculty members in these following departmental units: Curriculum and Instruction (early childhood, elementary, secondary, and vocational education); Professional Support Services (guidance and counseling, reading, school administration and supervision, school psychology, and special education); and Health and Physical Education. A specialization in multicultural/bilingual education crosses program lines. Many faculty members teach in different areas of specialization, thus changes occurring in one program generally affect other programs. The project is co-directed by the dean (Dr. Larry S. Bowen) and a senior special education faculty member (Dr. Barbara K. Given, who provided this program description); all project direction and substantive decision making is the responsibility of an appointed Task Force: parents of handicapped students, persons with disabilities, and faculty leaders.

> The first 10 months were devoted to operationalizing the project and raising the awareness of faculty members to the educational needs of handicapped individuals. During the first summer, elected faculty representatives were given a stipend to compile a set of preliminary competencies needed by GMU graduates. Projections were made to demonstrate the value of each competency. An annotated bibliography of audio-visual and printed materials, which were available in the Instructional Resource Center, accompanied the projections.
>
> During the second year, faculty representatives modified the basic competencies for congruence with overall program goals; thus each representative had the opportunity to aid in making the decisions affecting his/her program. The faculty representatives determined which competencies were under development and which needed to be added. Course sequences and syllabi are being modified to adjust for the changes.
>
> One means by which faculty members are rewarded for their efforts is by granting credit in a faculty-development course. Both senior and junior faculty members take advantage of this opportunity; their enthusiasm serves as a model for others. The course is conducted on an independent study basis. Arrangements are made for faculty members to visit exemplary public school classes where mainstreaming is on-going. The project sponsors faculty members' attendance at state and national conference sessions on the education of handicapped children and youth. Secretarial services are provided to assist in the preparation of manuscripts, and faculty members are publicly recognized for their participation in project activities.
>
> Summative data include (but are not limited to) number of recommendations made by the Task Force and implemented by project staff, number of faculty members who actively participate in project activities and the change process, and participant ratings of retreats and other project activities. Formative data include faculty analysis of project success, co-directors' analyses of faculty members' interest and involvement, and the quality of faculty products

resulting from the professional development course.

In preparation for writing this overview, nine faculty members (20%) were randomly selected and interviewed. Each was asked to comment on his/her perceptions of project uniqueness. The following three perceptions of the process emerged: (a) there is universal acceptance and involvement of the faculty in the project; (b) there is a willingness and competence among the project staff to conduct the project; (c) there is a high degree of effort to broaden the concept of mainstreaming in order to remove the image of a special interest group and to move special education into the mainstream of education.

When asked what aspects of the project have been most helpful, those interviewed gave responses that fell into five areas: The first was retreats. Faculty members feel that the comfortable, off-campus atmosphere is conducive to serious discussion, and that faculty interaction, communication, and problem solving are possible and enhanced at a retreat. Most striking was the excitement exhibited when those interviewed mentioned their change in attitude as a result of interactions with articulate disabled adults who "have been there."

After retreats, most mentioned were (a) introduction to and availability of audio-visual reference materials, (b) presentations by public school personnel and class presentations by project staff, (c) compiled competencies and projections, and (d) publisher responses to new materials. According to the co-director, the GMU Dean's Grant Project is unique in that it serves as a facilitator for faculty members to do what they know professionally needs to be done.

Implications for Change

ALTHOUGH many factors currently underscore the need for meaningful programs of faculty development in higher education, conducting successful faculty-development programs has many obstacles. Through the resources provided by Dean's Grant Projects, however, many SCDEs have instituted successful programs of faculty development that focus on the infusion of appropriate instructional methodology and content on Public Law 94-142 in teacher-education curricula.

The scope of programs for faculty development ranges from a segment of the faculty of a SCDE to the entire faculty of a university. Regardless of the scope of the undertaking, the general design of DGPs has three stages of development: (a) creating an awareness of the need for providing for handicapped students in regular classrooms, (b) a study of the knowledge and skills needed for implementation of the law, and (c) making the necessary instructional and curricular changes in teacher-education programs to attain the desired goals.

Dean's Grant Projects have provided resources to insure the success of faculty-development programs. They are a model for educational change in the elementary and secondary schools of the country which, I hope, will be emulated in the future when additional significant changes in education may be needed.

References

Berquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. A handbook for faculty development. Washington, D. C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Grosenick, J. K., & Woods, B. G. Faculty development in a college of education. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978, 175-185.

Hall, E. G. Facilitating institutional change using the individual as the frame of reference. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978, 47-71.

Heideman, R. G. Placement trends, 1980-81. Annual Report of Educational Placement and Career Services. Madison, WI: Educational Placement and Career Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1981.

Wood, F. H., Thompson, S. R., & Russell, Sr. F. Designing effective staff development programs. In B. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.), Staff development/organization development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981, 59-91.

Public Law 94-142 as an Organizing Principle for Teacher-Education Curricula

K. Charlie Lakin & Maynard C. Reynolds

University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT: This paper outlines and provides a rationale for a series of activities undertaken in connection with Dean's Grant Projects to explicate curricula for teacher-preparation programs from an analysis of the contemporary role and responsibilities of teachers. The development of role-based resource units for college faculty is described.

IDEAS are tested at their margins and so too, it can be said, are colleges of education. It is easy enough to prepare teachers to serve students who are the most convenient to teach: students of average or higher ability who attend well to classroom tasks and create few disturbances. However, Smith noted (1980b), "[T]he test of helping professions is whether they can serve those who cannot get along without them rather than those who can proceed or make progress without them" (p. 25). What about the students who truly test educators, the pupils on the margins? How well are teachers prepared to work, for example, with handicapped and disadvantaged students, children whose lives are in disorder and who bring the disorder with them to the schools, and students whose primary language is not English? It is these marginal pupils who have been the focus of most attention in the educational policy studies and federal legislation of the last two decades. In the past, the tendency was to refer marginal pupils to narrow categorical programs that often required the removal of students from the mainstream; in fact, between 1949 and 1970 the number of children referred out of regular classrooms to special education centers increased by 700%, and still more were removed for Title I classes and other special programs. Now, the press is on for

---

Mr. Lakin is a Research Scientist in the Department of Educational Psychology.

Dr. Reynolds, Professor of Special Education in the Department of Educational Psychology, was Director of the National Support Systems Project from 1975 to 1982 when the Project terminated.

SP 023 249

the reconstruction of the mainstream and the reorganization of teacher-preparation programs so that regular schools and classrooms will have more power to accommodate a greater range of human differences. Thus, advocates for the education of marginal pupils have been directing urgent questions to the people and institutions that prepare regular classroom teachers.

In A Common Body of Practice for Teachers (Reynolds, Birch, Grohs, et al., 1980), a volume that grew out of experience with Dean's Grant Projects, a case was made for increasing the professionalism of teacher-education programs by establishing curricula that included 10 areas of understandings and skills, called "clusters of capability," which derive from the new policies for the education of handicapped students. The educators[1] who initially drafted the common body of practice stated their rationale as follows:

> The goals of Public Law 94-142 will be realized only if the quality of teacher preparation and professional service in the schools can be improved. High priority must be given to substantial if not massive upgrading and retooling of the programs that prepare teachers. . . . (Reynolds et al., 1980, p. 5)

Of course, the recognition of the need for significant changes in the process of teacher education in the United States was not unique to the "common body" drafters. Criticisms of teacher education have appeared in publications ranging from the popular press (e.g., "Help, teacher can't teach," 1980; Means, 1981) to scholarly publications in the teacher-education field itself (Hall, Hord, & Brown, 1980; Smith, 1980a). "Teacher education programs need drastic revision," asserted Lawrence Cremin, President of Teachers College, Columbia University ("Pessimistic predictors. . .," 1981). Lyons (1980) described teacher education as "a massive fraud. It drives out dedicated people, rewards incompetence and wastes millions of dollars" (p. 108). The paper won a significant award for public service.

Despite the apparent consensus that teacher education needs much improvement, relatively few critics have specified the exact dimensions of the inadequacy or professed hope that the situation would be improved soon. Smith (1980c) captured well the complaints of many professionals about the present state of affairs:

> Let's face it. Colleges of pedagogy will in all probability never overhaul their programs if each college is to do it alone. There are too many hurdles, too much divisiveness and lethargy among faculties, too much fear, and too much ineptness in the leadership. (1980c, cover)

Ultimately, reported Smith and the discussants of his paper, a glimmer of hope, but not much more, could be discerned. Colleges of education are seen as reacting more to political and social pressures than to pedagogical urgencies. Forces governing teacher education are seen as hostile, domineering, ignorant, and malevolent. But is such professional negativism justified?

---

[1] Jack W. Birch, University of Pittsburgh; Dawn Grohs, Wichita Public Schools; Robert Howsam, University of Houston; Catherine Morsink, University of Florida; and Maynard C. Reynolds, University of Minnesota.

The Need for Common Beliefs

CERTAINLY a number of political and economic issues influence colleges of education, teachers' organizations, and organizations of school administrators. But to claim that the primary problem in teacher education today is the lack of necessary external support is akin to claiming that Humpty Dumpty remained in bits because the King lacked sufficient horses and men. One of the major difficulties is simply the lack of consensus among educators on what ought to be included in the curriculum for teacher-education programs and how such programs ought to be put together. Smith noted well that beyond the idea of inadequate support for the preparation of educators. "One of the most baffling and stubborn constraints upon reform of teacher education is the absence of common beliefs" (1980c, p. 88). In the AACTE bicentennial report on the profession of teaching, Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, and Nash (1976, p. 12) stressed the same problem, that is, the lack of a professional culture.

When the authors specified what must take place before teaching becomes an actual profession (as opposed to a semi-profession), they placed first on the list of prerequisites, "specific and much more rigorous criteria of professional competence will have to be met" (p. 16). Here, again, is revealed the chaos of no common professional culture, no agreement on what is important to the practice of educating children and youth, and no accepted model for preparing practitioners.

Speaking from a juridical point of view, Thomas Gilhool, attorney for the plaintiffs in the famous case of PARC vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1971), examined the general state of practice (in teaching) in relation to the much higher "state of the art" and asserted that it is the obligation of schools of education "not to share the state of the practice, but to use the state of the art" (1982). The use of the state(s) of the art, of course, requires first that they be spelled out. It was partly for this reason that work was begun, in the context of Dean's Grant Projects, to specify, at least initially, those clusters of capability that might define what a good beginning teacher should know and be able to do.

A Model for a Common Professional Culture and A Common Body of Teacher-Training Activities

ACCORDING to Smith (1980a), the first prerequisite to program development in an empirically based profession is that "the research must be assembled and classified with reference to various components of professional work" (p. 89). We, too, would stress the importance of structuring knowledge in terms of the roles that teachers are expected to perform. Professional schools have been created to transmit the knowledge and skills that enable their graduates to fulfill their social roles and responsibilities in the practice of their professions. Steps to meet that expectation in teacher education necessarily must begin with an analysis of the contemporary role and responsibilities of teachers.

Public Law 94-142[2] mandates an environment in the schools which has important implications for teachers' roles. In brief, the law entitles every handicapped child to an appropriate and free public education, based on the careful multidisciplinary assessments of his or her needs, and an explicit public plan for instruction which has been negotiated with the child's parents.

[2]The law is part of a broad base of interrelated law and judicial determinations at both federal and state levels. The main principles of the law are rooted in social policies that are independent of the law's provisions.

Due process rights are afforded to parents in all aspects of child study, planning, and program execution. An additional principle of key significance is that of the least restrictive environment, which means that the first obligation of public schools is to deliver individually appropriate programs to handicapped pupils while they remain in regular classrooms. It is primarily the latter principle that raises the broad issues of mainstreaming, but the law as a whole is an important stimulus for thinking about the role of classroom teachers.

Ten Clusters of Capability

By clear implication, Public Law 94-142 calls for teachers, both "regular" and "special," to have skills that are related to the education of all students, including those who have disabilities. It was in this context that the 10 clusters of general understandings and skills were identified. The delineation of these clusters or domains of professional responsibility does not assume mutual exclusivity; clearly, each overlaps with others in the day-to-day activities of a classroom. These domains are meant neither to be statements of specific teacher "competencies," of the type associated with competency-based teacher education, nor to suggest how teacher-education programs should prepare their students to meet their common responsibilities. The 10 clusters represent simply the attempt to identify the areas in which today's teachers have been given clear professional responsibility by Public Law 94-142 and to outline the functional nature of that responsibility.

Briefly, the 10 identified clusters and associated professional responsibilities are as follows:

1. Curriculum (i.e., what is deliberately taught in school)

The presence of exceptional youngsters in regular classrooms increases the breadth and variety of students' learning needs and skills. This greater spread of abilities, in turn, creates a major demand for curriculum that treats subject matter with fewer assumptions about prior learning and previously acquired skills. Therefore, all teachers should have a general knowledge of the school curriculum that is offered from kindergarten through high school (K-12). Every teacher should be able to describe the curricular content and objectives which are typical of the nation's elementary and secondary schools, and the rationale for each major curricular element. They should be able to relate the curriculum to what is known about the development of children and youth and to the functions of schools as social institutions. They must be skilled in the preparation of individualized curricular plans for children and be able to select, develop, modify, and assess curriculum materials based upon careful assessments of individual and group needs.

2. Teaching Basic Skills

Teachers should be able to teach basic skills effectively. These skills fall into three main categories: literacy, life maintenance, and personal development. Literacy skills are those for which the school has primary responsibility and which are necessary for continued learning as well as for efficient performance in most work situations. They include reading, which all teachers should be able to teach at least at rudimentary levels (word attack, word recognition, comprehension, and rate), writing (letter formation, sentence structure, and paragraph structure), spelling (rules and exceptions), arithmetic (whole-number computation, simple fractions, time, and measurement applications), study (use of resources, critical thinking, and organizing data), and speaking (sending and receiving accurate verbal messages,

expression, and intonation). Life maintenance skills are those necessary for survival and effective functioning in society. Sometimes referred to as survival or life skills, they include health (personal hygiene, physical exercise, and nutrition), safety (danger signs, maneuvering in traffic, and home safety), consumerism (making purchases, making change, and comparative shopping), and law (human rights, appeal process, court system, and personal liability). Personal development skills are necessary for personal growth. Because all individuals struggle with values, philosophical positions, moral behavior, and basic life issues, teachers should provide mature models for their students in these domains. They should be prepared to assist students in processes of goal setting, decision making, problem solving and conflict resolution, in both intra- and interpersonal dimensions, as aspects of their own personal development.

3. Class Management

Teachers should be able to apply individual and group management skills. When classes are skillfully managed, students can maintain attention to school-related learning activities and build positive feelings about themselves, their classmates, and their schools. Teachers need to be highly effective in group-alerting techniques, management of transitions in school activities, responses to daily crises, and management of a variety of learning activities. Time on task and favorable attitudes need to be maximized. Students should learn to share in responsibility for self-management. Teachers should be able to apply behavioral analysis procedures (sometimes called behavior modification or contingency management procedures) and other validated procedures to encourage both scholastic achievement and acceptable personal and social conduct, and to instruct parents and teachers' aides in applying those procedures under the teacher's guidance.

4. Professional Consultation and Communications

Teachers should be proficient in consultation and other forms of professional communication, as both initiators and receivers, to establish and maintain responsible interactions with colleagues and administrators. Teachers should be able to serve as consultants. Teachers who specialize, for instance, in working with children who have visual impairments should be able to consult with other teachers on the kinds of methods and materials that they should learn to use with visually impaired pupils in their regular classes. At the same time, teachers should learn to be competent receivers and users of consultation. Educators should be practiced at collaborating with colleagues who share responsibility for individual student's programs. Regular teachers and speech-language pathologists, for instance, must deliberately complement and reinforce each other's work with pupils. Teachers also need to know how to negotiate objectively and consistently with colleagues, administrators, employers, and other persons when their goals, values, philosophies, or priorities differ.

5. Teacher-Parent Relationships

Teachers should learn skills and sensitivity in dealing with parents of their students and especially with parents and siblings of handicapped, disadvantaged, and other exceptional students. They should know the effects of handicaps and social disadvantages on families, especially influences on family-school contacts and interactions between parents and teachers or other professionals. Teachers should be able to deal with instances of distrust, hostility, and anger, and, in turn, to build trust and cooperation. They should be prepared to share teaching

skills with parents so that both developmental and corrective program elements for students can be continued, whenever it is appropriate, in the home situation.

6. Student-Student Relationships

Teachers should be able to teach pupils how to relate to each other in ways that produce satisfaction and self-improvement. This ability should be based on counseling skills, knowledge and skill in using group activities that encourage cooperative behavior, and strong foundation studies in human development. Peer and cross-age teaching are specific forms of constructive relationships which can be used with advantages for all participants. Encouraging pupils to teach each other and to be helpful to one another offers very important learning experiences to the tutors as well as to those who are tutored. Teachers should be able to form heterogeneous groups of pupils to work cooperatively to achieve group goals. When teachers have the prerequisite skill to take solid command of the social structures of their classes through effective teaching, they have a powerful additional tool with which to construct individualized learning situations.

7. Exceptional Conditions

Teachers should know effective procedures for the instruction of students with exceptional conditions, such as limited sight or hearing, emotional problems, limited cognitive abilities, or outstanding talents and gifts, and they should be aware of the literature and body of practice in each area which can be pursued in depth when necessary. They also need to be familiar with the functions of various specialists who work in the schools (e.g., psychologists, educational audiologists, school social workers, resource teachers for the visually impaired, etc.) and to be prepared to establish team arrangements for the instruction of exceptional students. Teachers should have rudimentary knowledge about social and health services and know where additional help is available and how to get it.

8. Referral

When a pupil or parent presents a problem which a teacher feels unable to resolve, it is not a mark of inadequacy for the teacher to refer the questioner to a colleague. In fact, failure to make a referral in such an instance may deprive a person of access to someone who can provide help and constitutes a professional malpractice that may worsen a problem. It is important for teachers to recognize that making a referral is not to transfer "ownership" of a problem to a specialist; rather, it is a way of calling on a specialist who may be able to offer further help. Teachers need the skills to detect actual or potential problems, determine whether the solutions to the problems are within their professional competence, and, if not, refer to someone else for assistance. An important aspect of a good referral process is being able to make and report systematic observations of pupils who are experiencing difficulties. Teachers need to be competent in the observation of individual students within their classes.

9. Individualized Teaching

Teachers should be able to carry out individual assessments, spot special needs, personalize and adapt assignments, and keep records on individual pupil progress toward established objectives. Teachers should have mastered the tactics of instruction which result in a reasonably close match of the abilities of each pupil, the content that is being taught, and the methods and materials of instruction, so each fits well with the others. They should be skillful in developing objectives for each student

and be able to assess whether each student is meeting the objectives. A particularly important aspect of individualizing instruction is the ability to use assessment and grading systems that promote honest and useful sharing of information with the individual student and parents. Thus, teachers should be competent in domain- or criterion-referenced assessment and assembling case data for interpretation of the child's total educational situation. In addition, they should be able to conduct valid evaluations of their own instruction.

10. Professional Values

Teachers, in their personal commitments and professional behavior with pupils, parents, and colleagues, should exemplify the same consideration for all individuals and their educational rights as are called for in Public Law 94-142 and in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973. These include the right of individual students to due process in all school placement decisions, to education in the least restrictive environment, and to carefully individualized education. Teachers should be skilled in assisting others (parents, colleagues, pupils) in understanding and accepting as positive values the increasing diversity of students who are enrolled in regular school programs. They need to be able to listen to opposing viewpoints without considering them as attacks on their own behavior or values. Teachers should provide skillful and consistent models of professionalism and of commitment.

The Uses of the Common Body Approach

THE conception of the training responsibilities of colleges and departments of education in terms of these 10 clusters of capability is, of course, but one possibility for organizing a teacher-education curriculum; however, any approach to teacher education these days must give attention to the implications of the new policies on handicapped students. In a survey of all 112 Dean's Grant Projects operating in 1979-80, it was found that a sizable majority of both faculty members and students judged the 10 clusters of capability to be "a viable framework for viewing teacher-education programs." A number of these projects' intensive curriculum analyses and development activities have used the 10 clusters as a conceptual model (Gazvoda, 1980).

Some project personnel have called for additional detailing of the clusters. Accordingly, the National Support Systems Project has supported the development of resource units which explicate the nature of knowledge and skills in each cluster. The primary purpose of these units is to outline the scope of accepted knowledge and practice in rather specific areas of professional performance which are essential to the effective teaching of all students in today's schools. The progress and outcome of these units are described in the following section.

Developing a Set of Subskills from the Ten Clusters of Capability

TO identify a set of subtopics under each of the 10 clusters, NSSP solicited assistance from educators who were active in the Dean's Grant Projects network. Each respondent had confronted the curricular needs of future mainstream teachers and was considered knowledgeable in the areas in which college faculty members are developing programs. Using a modified Delphi technique to survey 225 project deans and coordinators in 112 projects, NSSP mailed out in early June 1980 a 10-page document. Each page contained one cluster of capability, a rationale for including it in a teacher-training program, and a description of the possible contents of 3-5 suggested subtopics. The first set of sub-

topics was identified informally by NSSP staff numbers, considering that certain knowledge and expertise tended to "cluster" in each of the 10 areas. Respondents were asked to detail changes in the proposed subtopics and to suggest additional areas under each cluster which ought to be considered. Finally, respondents were asked to nominate persons who, in their opinions, were particularly capable of describing the knowledge base and current professional practices in each subtopic area. Of the 225 questionaires that were sent out, 89 were returned. In many cases a number of other faculty members participated in evaluating/refining these subtopics. In all, over 140 persons helped to write the responses to all or parts of the questionnaire. About 135 potential authors were nominated to deal with the various subtopics.

Responses received on the first survey were used to modify and edit the form for the second round of inquiry. Again, the questionnaires were sent to the project deans and coordinators and they were asked again to react to the suggested subtopics, to nominate persons whom they considered especially capable of outlining the content of a particular subtopic, and to rate each proposed subtopic for the level of priority it should be given in the NSSP developmental work. Of the second round questionnaires, 82 were returned with an additional 100 nominations of potential expositors. The responses were then edited into a final set of topics for resource units and authors were identified.

Development of Resource Units Within the Ten Clusters of Capability

From the two rounds of analysis of the 10 clusters of capability, twenty-eight subtopics were recommended for development. Those subtopics are listed in Table 1 according to the priority given each by the participants in the modified Delphi process; names and affiliations of scholars nominated and agreeing to draft each of the resource units also appear in Table 1.

Each resource unit consists of a list of "reasonable objectives" for teacher-education programs in the topical area, a self-assessment procedure which can be completed individually or in groups by teacher educators, a rating system for present training programs, a 25-50 page review of the relevant base of knowledge and professional practice, hypothetical school situations which can be used to check understanding, a list of instructional aids and activities, a brief bibliography, and a final section that includes reprints of several major articles on the subject of the unit. The largest part of each unit is the review of the knowledge base, which includes main definitional elements and a summary of the well-established principles (for teachers) in the area. In areas in which the gap between the knowledge base and the training of teachers in specific skills is considerable, the resource units also present methods for teaching those skills to prospective teachers. After it was drafted, each unit was appraised by persons who are also knowledgeable in that area and then returned to the primary author for final revision.

The resource units are intended strictly for use by teacher educators.[3] They are neither textbooks nor instructional modules; rather, they are a means of communication among teacher

---

[3]Resource units are available from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

educators about the "state of the art" in areas relating to specific responsibilities of today's teachers. The material is designed to be used by an individual (completing the self-assessment test and/or reading through the unit on classroom management for the content or the recent literature on the topic) or a group (reviewing the contents of a teacher-education program curriculum). Like the clusters of capability from which the resource units derive, the modules are not intended to dictate the curricula of teacher-education programs. Rather, their purpose is to encourage teacher educators to recognize the contemporary responsibilities of teachers, to suggest that teacher educators have a role in developing teachers who can meet these responsibilities, and to outline a base of validated knowledge and practice directly related to each area of teacher responsibility.

There is little hope of developing comprehensive programs for preparing teachers without a sound organizing principle. Although Public Law 94-142 is not the only principle by which a teacher-training program could be structured, it is the one with contemporary relevance, appropriateness, and appeal.

Summary

IT is widely agreed that our schools are not as effective as they should be and that the preparation of teachers is one of the prime targets for improvement. A particular concern is to help the "regular" school and "regular" teacher to become better able to serve "marginal" students, those who, in large numbers, present a variety of special needs. There are many reasons not to blame the many problems in American education on the colleges themselves, but there also seems to be very good reason not to absolve them. The low level of intellectual stimulation in teacher-training programs, which is a frequently cited reason for the low, average ability level of incoming teacher-education students, does not derive directly from the content of the teaching role itself. There is much to be known about learning, social psychology, counseling, interpersonal communication, individual differences, individualized education, group dynamics, behavior modification, curriculum selection, modifying educational materials, and measuring instructional gains (the list could go on) before one can adequately meet the standards of the contemporary teacher's job description. This is no time for the erosion of job-related content in the teacher-education curriculum because the demands on teachers are growing steadily. It would seem that keeping abreast of those demands and providing related adequate training experiences is the least that can be asked of teacher-training programs.

References

Gazvoda, M. W. A descriptive and statistical study of the Dean's Grant Projects: Federal support for change in teacher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University, 1980.

Gilhool, T. K. The 1980s: Teacher preparation programs, handicapped children, and the courts. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), The future of mainstreaming: Next steps in teacher education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1982.

Hall, G., Hord, S., & Brown, G. Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1980.

"Help! Teacher can't teach!" Time Magazine, June 15, 1980, 54-63.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G. W., & Nash, R. J. Educating a profession. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Lyons, G. Why teachers can't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62 (2), 108-112.

Means, H. Let us now bury the public schools. Washingtonian, May 1981, 89-98.

(PARC) Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E.D. Pa. 1971).

"Pessimistic predictors say quality of teachers, training is sliding down." Minneapolis Tribune, July 12, 1980.

Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1980.

Smith, B. O. A design for a school of pedagogy. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. (a)

Smith, B. O. On the content of teacher education. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, 1980. (b)

Smith, B. O. Pedagogical education: How about reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, cover, 87-93. (c)

Table 1

Resource Units and Authors

	Unit Topic	Author(s)
1.	Classroom accommodations for exceptional learners	JoBeth Allen (Kansas State University) Frances L. Clark (University of Louisville) Patricia Gallagher (University of Kansas) Faith Scofield (University of Kansas)
2.	Classroom assessment and evaluation strategies	Alan M. Hofmeister (Utah State University) Caroline N. Preston (Utah State University)
3.	Curriculum assessment and modification	Christine O'Connell Mason (Eastern Montana College) Susan Blom Raison (Southeast Minnesota Education Cooperative Service Unit)
4.	Variables in exceptionality	Jack W. Birch (University of Pittsburgh)
5.	Writing Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)	Ann L. Stewart (North Carolina State University)
6.	Assessing and promoting reading skills	Michael F. Graves (University of Minnesota)
7.	Assessing and promoting language arts skills	James A. Poteet (Ball State University)
8.	Teaching study skills	
9.	Class management	Richard Bents (University of Minnesota) K. Charlie Lakin (University of Minnesota) Maynard C. Reynolds (University of Minnesota)
10.	Social/philosophical-ethical foundations	Christopher Lucas (University of Missouri)
11.	Behavior modification procedures	Lanny Morreau (Illinois State University)
12.	Developing goals and objectives	Lynn S. Fuchs (Wheelock College) Stanley L. Deno (University of Minnesota)
13.	Parent-teacher interactions	Roger Kroth (University of New Mexico) Roberta Krehbiel (University of New Mexico)

	Unit Topic	Author(s)
14.	Formal social observation	Frank H. Wood (University of Minnesota)
15.	Legal influences on educating special needs students	Ann P. Turnbull (University of Kansas) Judith Leonard (University of North Carolina) H. Rutherford Turnbull (University of Kansas)
16.	Teaching children about individual differences	Mara Sapon-Shevin (Cleveland State University)
17.	Promoting pupil psychological growth	Angelo V. Boy (University of New Hampshire)
18.	Psychological/human development foundations	Ronna Dillon (Southern Illinois University)
19.	Counseling skills for teachers	Norman Sprinthall (North Carolina State University)
20.	Communication skills for teachers	Carolyn M. Del Polito (American Society of Allied Health Professions)
21.	Principles and values in special education	H. Rutherford Turnbull (University of Kansas) Ann P. Turnbull (University of Kansas) Marilyn Mulligan (University of Kansas)
22.	Individualized instructional systems	Margaret C. Wang (University of Pittsburgh)
23.	Working with minority students and parents	Ronald W. Henderson (University of California-Santa Cruz)
24.	Working with support staff and allied professions	Susan M. Swap (Wheelock College)
25.	Assessing and promoting basic "life skills"	Donn Brolin (University of Missouri)
26.	Promoting cooperative relationships in classrooms	David W. Johnson (University of Minnesota) Roger T. Johnson (University of Minnesota)
27.	Consultation skills for teachers	Joel Meyers (Temple University)
28.	Peer and cross-age tutoring	Joseph R. Jenkins (University of Washington) Linda M. Jenkins (Lake Washington [WA] Schools)

Elementary Education: Curriculum and Programs for Teacher Education

Fay B. Haisley

University of Oregon

ABSTRACT: A major concern of teacher educators since the passage of Public Law 94-142 has been with the need to produce graduates capable of providing appropriate educations for the handicapped children in regular classrooms. This need has been addressed by Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) which have systematically reviewed, redesigned, and reorganized their programs, curriculum content, and delivery systems. Revision is continuing, and DGPs show evidence that they are graduating elementary teachers who are now capable of dealing with the diversity of student skills and behaviors in mainstream settings.

BY 1975-76, evidence was available that from 25 to 40 percent of all school children display variations in learning styles that require specially designed educational programs for at least part of their school years (Rubin & Balow, 1971). The national model of teacher preparation at the time clearly did not adequately prepare regular teachers to deal effectively with such a range of student diversity in regular classrooms. Such facts, coupled with the mandates of new legislation, elicited the following observation from Reynolds (1978b):

Dr. Haisley, Associate Dean for the Division of Teacher Education at the University of Oregon, has been the director of the Dean's Grant Project since 1977. She was the Elementary Coordinator for the DGP curriculum redesign activities and currently is carrying out research related to admission procedures for elementary pre-service trainees and follow-up of program graduates.

This chapter was prepared with the consultation of and assistance from Dr. Robert D. Gilberts, Dean of the College of Education, who has been the Principal Investigator for the Dean's Grant Project, and the Liaison of the Far West Region since 1975.

SP 023 250

> College programs must change to meet new school policies and to prepare personnel for new roles. Faculties of education may try to resist the structural changes inherent in the social policies for handicapped students. But if changes are not made in the colleges, public schools probably will develop new programs and roles independently of colleges of education. (p. 28)

Systems, however, resist change. Montgomery (1978) suggested that "like giant oysters they try to smooth down or expel irritants" (p. 112); and Reynolds (1978a), observing that school districts might try merely to "stay out of jail," restated this concern in the context of teacher-education programs: "[T]he danger is considerable that some communities will go through the motions ...and consume a great deal of time and resources but will advance the cause of the handicapped by little or not at all" (p. 60).

The pressures for change remain strong. Nelli (1981) reinforced Reynolds's concern when she concluded,

> Those who claim to have priority in conceptualizing teacher preparation--teachers, administrators, professional associations, state boards, legislators, and college faculty, among others--must reach consensus about a common perspective regarding what trainees should know and be able to do when they graduate. Otherwise teacher preparation will degenerate into minimal requirements mandated by exasperated state legislatures. (p. 42)

An editorial (Preservice training, 1981) in the newsletter published by the Dean's Grant Project at Gonzaga University, noted that colleges and universities are challenged to assume an immediate active posture in the development of competencies for the inclusion of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms.

> There is a vast difference between merely advocating the principle and redesigning training programs philosophically and instructionally to adequately prepare regular and special educators for new roles associated with mainstreaming implementations.

In the past, college faculties were slow to respond to training changes, even with the "bandwagon" effects of, for example, new curriculum programs developed during the early 1970s by energetic and dedicated educators with seemingly unlimited funding; by and large, however, these programs were unique to their area of influence and close to project and program resources. The programs, in general, have not created lasting change in the total system. For new curriculum programs to be effective over the long term the change must be supported by a national network that includes support systems for common goal setting, information processing, program review, and product dissemination.

Such long-term effects are finally being documented by Dean's Grant Projects. An infusion of funds from Deans' Grants on college campuses, along with project information and evaluation, have led to a new sense of accountability in teacher-training

programs: accountability for training teachers to meet the needs of handicapped children in mainstream classrooms. Accountability has led to a continuing internal evaluation and revision of the teacher-training process on individual campuses in the attempt to change, adapt, and revise curriculums and their delivery systems.

Curricular changes have been demonstrated by and documented in the development of training systems, modules, curriculum guides, course outlines, competency check lists, and increased attention to trainee competency in practicum and student-teaching settings. To provide the climate for the integration of these new changes, college faculty members have been exposed to numerous "awareness" workshops and training sessions; have participated in the revision, redesign, and reorganization of their programs; and have become more involved with cooperating field-based teachers in a team effort to insure that trainees will have necessary competencies to work with children with diverse needs. The result? A swing from a concentration on the "art of teaching" to the "science of teaching" or, at least, a swing to what Gage (1978) called a "scientific basis to the art of teaching." In addition, the closer philosophical alignment of project personnel, a new impetus for increased attention to screening and admissions criteria for teacher applicants, a new commitment to more definitive training goals and objectives, and more planning for the demonstration and documentation of trainee competence have been positive outcomes of DGPs.

How Did Change Proceed?

WHITMORE (1981), reporting on curriculum organization by DGPs, noted that when we look at successful DGPs we should recognize that "there is no way that always works best." At the same time, however, she outlined the generally observable organizational structure of projects:

> It was recognized that in order for the desired curriculum reform to occur, a facilitative organizational structure for major institutional changes was needed. Changes centered on the integration of special and regular education faculty members and their teacher-education curricula. Many projects engaged in what was fundamentally a competency/performance-based process of program development. That process included (a) defining the faculty's philosophy of teacher education, (b) specifying the expected outcomes of teacher education in terms of desired characterisrics of program graduates, and (c) conducting a thorough evaluative review of existing programs to suggest the modification and/or addition of program content which would result in better prepared teachers. (p. 51)

She saw the critical factor in curricular change to be participants who take responsibility for carrying out the design or selection of curricular content.

> [The issue is not the <u>development</u> of curriculum modules but] whether the persons who will use them are involved in (a) specifying the outcomes desired, (b) examining existing resources and

> developing materials or content not currently available, and then (c) evaluating the usefulness of the adopted or developed curriculum in carrying out the revised instructional program. (p. 62)

A survey of "mature" projects by the National Support Systems Project is reported in Bates (1981). One question that is relevant to this discussion was, "What did you learn about curriculum change in connection with your DGP?" Most respondents agreed that the process of curriculum change in teacher education turned out to be more difficult than they had anticipated. Some of the common observations included the following:

- It is worthwhile to make careful surveys of existing curricula; they ought to be made more often.
- Sequencing problems in teacher education are very important and should be given more attention. For example, members of the foundations of education faculty must accept the responsibility to cover certain specific topics in order that the advancement to professional studies has the necessary undergirding.
- Developmental work on curriculum cannot be totally "imported"; materials developed by others can be helpful, but ultimately, the developmental work must be conducted locally.
- Strong components of general education and foundational studies are essential to teacher education; the DGPs help to make it obvious. For example, one cannot teach effectively about individual differences among children unless and until strong background is provided in basic child development. (Bates, 1981, p. 38)

What Progresss Has Been Made?

In a survey of 112 DGPs (111 responded; see Gazvoda, 1980), 72% of the respondents reported significant or complete teacher-education curriculum changes. Curriculum change was defined as a continuum of identifying needs, planning, and carrying out changes. Project personnel reported that pilot testing of new curricula could be expected in project years 2 and 3, and full institutionalization of plans, including evaluation, revision, refinement, and extension to other areas of teacher education, during years 4-6. Gazvoda (1980), attempting to establish rankings for common goals in DGPs, noted that curriculum changes in teacher education were ranked first and received strong attention.

Curriculum development was reported to include new courses and/or new elements in existing courses (in some situations total revisions of entire programs were documented). Curricular changes undertaken as part of DGP activities varied greatly. Gazvoda agreed with Reynolds that defining the common body of practice which Public Law 94-142 requires of teachers is central to the development of a common framework for the review of current programs. Even though the diversity of approaches across institutions is great, 70% of responding DGPs indicated a shift in program emphasis predicated upon the definition of the 10 clusters of capability (Reynolds, 1980a).

The following curricular activities are reported by NSSP to be common (Reynolds, 1980a):

- Development of a course on exceptionalities among students which is required of all teacher-education students. Sometimes more than one course is required. For example, sets of two or three new courses have been created for addition to the teacher-preparation core.
- Existing courses are examined and then revised to include components relating to handicapped students. Very often, this process follows a faculty study of needed competencies. Sometimes existing courses are changed by adding or substituting specific modules which have been obtained or developed in selected areas.
- Total teacher-preparation programs are reexamined and revised to add or improve coordination across foundations courses, professional studies, and practicums. Usually, this kind of broad approach develops only after preliminary activities of lesser scope. The "first steps" are taken most often in the elementary education program and then revisions are undertaken in secondary education and special teaching fields.
- Attention is given to the development and use of practicum stations in schools that exemplify as fully as possible the kinds of situations and challenges which can be anticipated under Public Law 94-142. (pp. 30-31)

About half the DGPs reported that one or more new courses have been developed as a result of the DGP. In approximate order of frequency, the courses are as follows:

- The Exceptional Child in the Regular Class (a survey course on exceptional children in mainstream classes; sometimes separate sections are offered for students in elementary and secondary education, vocational education, etc.).
- Reading and Learning Disabilities (or Diagnostic Prescriptive Instruction).
- Practicums with Handicapped Students (often with accompanying seminar)
- Administrative Issues in Mainstreaming.
- Adapted Physical Education.
- Assessment of Special Needs Students.
- Mathematics Difficulties.
- Preschool Mainstreaming.
- Conferencing Skills for Teachers.
- Children in Groups: The interaction of normal and special needs students. (pp. 39-40)

One of the more useful sources for information on curriculums comes from Bates (1980). He drew together the documentation on 19 "individualized" projects. The contributors noted at the outset of the report,

> If the setting for the Dean's Grant Projects were a laboratory, one could run an experimental behavior "X" number of times and derive a profile. But the projects are not housed in laboratories. They are housed in universities and colleges. (p. 69)

The team reported,

> In analyzing the objectives and activities by which projects met their anticipated levels of attainment for stated goals, some commonalities were found that seemed to be specific to the age of the project. Projects in the first year of operation were consistent in identifying a need for change in course content to help students to better understand mainstreaming issues; 50 percent of the projects for this year had taken preliminary steps toward the analysis of course content. Commonalities of the first year projects in the category of "Experience" were noted in the specification of initial steps of reexamining and revising students' field experiences. A curriculum goal addressed the issues of reviewing, developing and disseminating appropriate learning aids.

The common activities in the area of "Courses" for the four second-year projects included plans for the in-depth revision of curriculum and incorporating the revisions in the targeted course syllabi. All four projects addressed the issue of expanding student field experience in special education and mainstreamed classrooms (p. 84).

The four projects in the third-year-plus of operation set as goals more expansive and intensive revisions of course contents. "The focus was on interdepartmental work and audio-visual instructional aids. The Experience category for these old projects featured increased emphasis on pre-service student experiences with mainstreamed classrooms, as well as the exploration of dual certification standards and licensing in their respective states" (p. 85).

In the area of "Curriculum" the team reported that "there seems to be a sequential developmental pattern from projects in their first year of operation to those in their third-plus phase" (p. 86). An apparent continuum focuses on identifying the need for change, and on planning and initiating appropriate steps for change. This is followed by the carrying out of designed formats, the evaluating of the pilot program, self-correction, and repetition of the cycle.

The team's conclusion "that projects may be more alike in both goals and strategies than might be expected by the variation in project settings" (p. 87) is heartening to note. Espeseth (1982) reported similar conclusions after a series of informal surveys of and visits to projects in the Far West Region. The DGPs were reported to be the catalyst for curriculum change; and projects generally indicated the need for a separate course related to handicapping conditions as well as the infusion of special course content into the curriculum. Espeseth also noted that despite the great disparity in project philosophy and organizational structure at the institutional level, there was unanimous agreement on the need for curriculum change and generally positive attitudes, overall, to the changes in progress.

The University of Nebraska at Lincoln and the University of Oregon in Eugene have programs that mirror the general development of DGPs.

At the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, the project has been one of the programs electing curriculum integration. A statement prepared for certification purposes follows:

> Students completing the four-year undergraduate teacher education program at UN-L have experienced a curriculum sequence designed to prepare them to teach handicapped students in the "mainstream" of the regular classroom.

The curriculum sequence is spelled out in several documents but Table 1 shows course identification for 10 areas of major content. Aksamit, Wilhelsm, and Kilgore (1981) presented a comprehensive document on their project's approach to the Integration of Curriculum at the annual Dean's Grant Conference in Washington, D.C. A brief overview follows.

> The Integration Paradigm
>
> Mainstream curriculum integration is currently focused in the undergraduate program. Teachers College units most extensively involved are Educational Psychology and Social Foundations (EPSF), in which three core courses occur; and Curriculum and Instruction (C & I), which includes methods classes and practicum seminars in elementary and secondary education. Designated curriculum is introduced in the three core EPSF courses taken during the freshman and sophomore years. Knowledge and skills are further developed and applied to subject areas throughout methods courses and student-teaching seminars completed during the junior and senior years.
>
> All students in Teachers College are exposed to the mainstream curriculum as integrated in the three core EPSF courses. As students focus on their major area of study, they receive methods instruction within different Teachers College units. There is, consequently, some variation in the way methods-level mainstream curriculum is presented.
>
> Following the conclusion of the first year of formalized mainstream curriculum integration, faculty at UN-L expressed concern that there was a great deal of variability in the content being presented in the 12 different sections of this freshman foundations course. This resulted in part from variability in faculty awareness and expertise. As a result, faculty and project staff collaborated in the development of a curriculum "packet." The curriculum packet, which was completed for Fall 1980 use, includes: (1) objectives to be addressed in the course; (2) learning activities designed to teach objectives; (3) materials to be used by faculty and/or stu-

[1] All tables follow the text of the chapter.

dents; and (4) alternative instructional strategies for use in teaching to the objectives.

The curriculum packet is not a standardized module that all faculty must use in the same way. Rather, the packet is to be used selectively as a resource for faculty and students as mainstream curriculum is integrated. A major effort is currently under way whereby project staff and faculty use the packet in a team-teaching approach. It is intended that such a strategy will assist faculty in using the packet as a resource following project completion when project staff will no longer be available as resource persons.

Elementary Education

The Center for Curriculum and Instruction has developed a program which includes a sequence of learning activities designed to prepare the preservice elementary teacher to meet the needs of mainstreamed children. The first level, labeled the awareness level, occurs during the freshman/sophomore semesters. Students are made aware of the necessity to adapt curriculum and teaching strategies to the special needs of children with handicaps. The student is required to observe a mainstreamed child and, as part of the report written about these pre-student teaching experiences, writes an analysis of the way this mainstreamed child is accommodated in the regular classroom.

The second level, the methodological level, occurs during the sophomore/junior/senior semesters when the student is enrolled in methods classes. In each methods class students are instructed in techniques to use in teaching that particular subject.

The third level, the application level, occurs when the senior is student teaching. During the curriculum seminar which accompanies student teaching, each student is required to write three papers. These papers address: (1) rationale and legislative mandates; (2) strategies for adapting curriculum to meet the needs of handicapped children; and (3) roles and responsibilities among classroom teacher, parents and support personnel. In addition, each student teacher is required to design a lesson or series of lessons to meet the needs of a mainstreamed child.

A synthesis of the mainstream curriculum is designed to occur during the process of student teaching.

The major goal of the Elementary Education program at the University of Oregon, during the years the DGP was functioning, was to develop a model training program to prepare elementary education pre-service regular teachers to provide effective instruction to students, including those with handicaps, who exhibit wide differences in ability and behavior. Beginning in

1977-78 the Elementary Education faculty put into action a plan calling for the design of a set of competency-based courses to operate with the new "Training Elementary Educators for Mainstreaming (TEEM) Program." These competencies (Table 2) were organized into a matrix (Haisley, 1978) to show the relation of coursework to program goals and to serve as guidelines for the revision of existing courses.

On the basis of the matrix by Haisley and Hazelhurst (1979), a questionnaire was designed to evaluate the competence of graduates. In Part A, students were asked to respond to the question, "How do you perceive the importance of the TEEM Program objectives, and to what extent did the program help you to achieve those objectives?"

The mean response to each item by the 13 (of the 45) graduating seniors who completed Part A of the questionnaire is set out in Table 3. The dotted line extending to the right of each item indicates the mean response to the level of achievement of each competency acquired by the students during the period of teacher education. The continuous line immediately below the dotted line indicates the mean level of importance given each competency.

Table 3 also shows a couple of appreciable variations in differences between ratings of importance and level of achievement for individual competencies. Table 4 lists those items (from Table 3) with a mean difference of 1.6 or more.

By determining a group mean for each section of the questionnaire, it was possible to rank the sections according to the student's rating of the importance of the items in each section. Table 5 sets out the means for each section of items in Part A of the questionnaire.

The three sections regarded as having the most important competencies were "1.0, Instructional Goals and Planning"; "6.0, Foundation Disciplines"; and "3.0, Use of Instructional Strategies." It is interesting to note the difference between the importance of the competency areas and the extent to which graduating seniors felt that they had achieved that competence: In each area, excepting 1.0 and 6.0, graduating seniors rated their level of achievement higher than they rated the importance of the competency area. This finding may be interpreted as evidence of changes in teacher education in Elementary Education in the College of Education at the University of Oregon.

In sum, graduating seniors perceived all the competencies to be important, rating "Instructional Goals and Planning" the highest, with a mean of 4.25. The seniors gave high ratings to the extent to which the TEEM program helped them to achieve program competencies; "Use of Instructional Strategies" has a reported mean of 4.61.

Part B of the questionnaire was designed to assess the importance of the student practicum experience, to give an overall rating to the program, and to estimate its value as a preparation for teaching. The data in Table 6 indicate that the student-teaching experience was valuable in helping students to tie together methods, theories, and classroom practice. This item's rating was 4.83. The mean for the students' overall rating of the program is 4.2, and for how well the program prepared them for teaching, 4.1.

It should be remembered that the graduating seniors had not yet been exposed to the "real" world of teaching. A follow-up of these graduates (after 2 years of teaching) and of a group of first-year graduates is currently under way.

What Are the Curriculum Products?

THE Report of the Deans' Grants Products (NSSP, 1981) is evidence of the growing body of literature produced by DGPs. The products include curriculum modules, course guides, teacher competency lists, evaluation instruments, resource handbooks, learning activity packets for methods students, inservice training plans, and annotated bibliographies. Some examples follow:

- The University of Kansas DGP has put together a series of curriculum units on Character Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Instructional Management, Communication Skills, and Legal, Philosophical and Social Issues.

- At the University of Texas at Austin, Project PREM developed 10 curriculum modules for use in training teacher educators to work with handicapped children in least restrictive environments.

- The DGP at the University of North Carolina produced several program and resource guides, one of which is entitled Developing and Implementing Individualized Educational Programs.

- At the University of Nebraska at Omaha, the DGP made up a list of curriculum skills required in its CORE program and a syllabus for each mini-course. This program was extensively evaluated and revised, on the basis of student and faculty contributions.

- The University of Illinois DGP developed detailed descriptions of the Specialized Instruction Program; it includes the program of inservice training for cooperative teachers.

- At the University of Hawaii, the DGP developed a detailed framework for integrating mainstreaming competencies into new or existing courses in the B.Ed. program.

The list of products from DGPs grows at an almost alarming rate. As projects have "matured" and moved into a refinement and evaluation phase, product dissemination seems to have increased. It would be a good idea for the list of products to be updated frequently and for the materials to be cross-referenced to the 10 clusters of capability to facilitate decisions on materials selection and use.

Issues Affecting Curriculum

NATIONAL concern with the competence of teachers has led educators to question the adequacy of the current methods of teacher-training programs. An important step to upgrade the quality of teacher-training programs is the raising of admission requirements (Dunn, 1982). Indicators of the significance of this question are found in recent publications that include, among others, the special issue of Phi Delta Kappan (1981) and Schwanke (1981), an annotated bibliography of studies related to admissions criteria and their effectiveness.

An integral part of the reorganization plan for curriculum change at the University of Oregon was attention to the quality

of pre-service applicants. The result was more rigorous screening and admissions procedures. The system is based on objective measures, such as standardized achievement tests, semi-objective measures that include writing tests, and a more subjective measure, the professional interview (Rankin, 1982). An evaluation of this system was undertaken by Dunn (1982). The preliminary results indicate that University of Oregon graduates appear to be exceptionally strong in a broad range of skills. An evaluation of student teachers in Fall 1982 by their cooperating teachers and supervisors indicated above average ratings on all items (Table 8). Follow-up studies of these graduates will be made during their teaching careers to document teacher effectiveness as it relates to training goals and objectives.

Gazvoda (1980) noted the need for the documentation of effective teacher-training models to translate the knowledge accommodated in DGPs into standards for teacher certification and program accreditation.

Some pressure already has been applied on all colleges in certain states where licensing bodies have adopted certification requirements relating to competence in teaching handicapped children. Many DGP personnel, however, have been members of the state department committees that developed these competency check lists. The following statement for Oregon, which was adopted by DGPs in the state but is not mandatory at this writing, lists minimum competencies for elementary teachers under the major headings of knowledge and skills. A consensus of the Pre-service Training faculty is needed, however, before the translation of similar competency lists to certification requirements can be undertaken at the national level.

> Knowledge of the definitions, characteristics and eligibility requirements of handicapped and disabled school aged children as defined in Oregon Administrative Rules 581-15-051 to include:
>
> <u>Knowledge of</u>:
>
> 1. The characteristics of handicapped students.
> 2. Eligibility criteria for special education and related services for handicapped students.
> 3. Federal and state laws and regulations relative to handicapped students.
> 4. Procedural safeguards for handicapped students, parents, and teachers.
> 5. State Administrative Procedures for working with handicapping conditions in terms of:
> a) student identification.
> b) individual assessment.
> c) I.E.P. development.
> d) individualized instruction.
> e) related services.
> f) individualized education plan review.
> g) least restrictive environment.
> 6. The components of an individualized educational plan:
> a) the pupils' current educational status.
> b) educational goals needed for the pupil.
> c) instructional objectives leading to each goal.
> d) instructional and service requirements for program implementation.

7. Modifications and adaptations which can be made in general education to accommodate a handicapped learner.

Skills in informal assessment and a variety of instructional techniques and procedures for implementation of the educational plan for handicapped pupils:

Skills in:

1. a) student identification.
   b) individual assessment.
   c) I.E.P. development.
   d) individualized instruction.
   e) related services.
   f) individualized education plan review.
   g) least restrictive environment.
   h) adapting curriculum and/or instructional environment to meet the needs of the handicapped student.
2. Interpersonal skills (i.e., effective communication with administrators, students, parents, resource personnel and community groups to solve educational problems).
3. Classroom management and teaching strategies (i.e., proficiency in class management procedures, including applied behavior analysis, materials arrangement, crisis intervention techniques, and group approaches to creating positive affective climates).
4. Development of student social interaction (i.e., the ability to provide guidance and implement procedures which promote student personal growth and encourage student involvement with handicapped students in a variety of educational settings).

Hersh and Walker (in press) believe that "the quality of teachers and the classroom conditions they create are what should occupy our future attention." We cannot ignore this issue. The evaluation data from graduates of DGP programs in school settings over the next few years will begin to fill in the missing feedback loop and encourage new rounds of program reorganization and curriculum modification. Hersh and Walker noted,

> In our most romantic moments, we believe that properly trained teachers and appropriate schooling conditions are the salvation of all children. Our research is based on that assumption and although we have not yet discovered the secret of how to create these conditions, we believe we have begun to get a handle on two of the variables--teacher expectations and teacher efficacy--which the research we have reviewed indicates are important and which we believe are potentially salient if we are to create optimal mainstreaming conditions.

They noted also that their review of the literature points "to an urgent need to question the conditions under which we expect teachers and students to be successful." Certainly, this

issue must be raised in pre-service preparation, and attention to the clarification of teachers' social standards and expectations should be encouraged. Hersh and Walker found that current methods of teacher training have not eliminated the "historical burdens of teacher labeling and stereotyping of handicapped students, peer rejection and abuse, and the behavioral communication of low-performance expectations."

Conclusion

INEVITABLY, other issues to redirect the curriculum focus of teacher-training programs will continue to emerge. At this point, however, it is safe to note that the DGPs, by the systematic review and reorganization of pre-service training programs, have done more to move the teacher-education field forward, and for fewer dollars, than any other initiative in recent history. The fact that the program changes are becoming institutionalized augers well for the future progress of the mainstream movement and its continued influence in the field of teacher education.

References

Aksamit, D. L., Wilhelms, M., & Kilgore, A. Preparing classroom teachers to work with mainstreamed handicapped children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects, Washington, DC, 1981.

Bates, P. The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation (Central Regional Evaluation Report). Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1981.

Connel, K. (Ed.). Philosophical position on mainstreaming of the department of occupational and adult education. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University. Newsletter--College of Education Dean's Grant, September/October 1981, 2(4).

Dillon, R. F., & Stevenson-Hicks, R. The importance of understanding developmental models for systematic instruction of all learners. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. College of Education, Dean's Grant Newsletter, Fall 1981.

Doyle, W. Research on classroom contexts. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(6).

Duckworth, K. Linking educational policy and management with student achievement. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1981.

Dunn, J. A. A study of the relationship between selected factors and acceptance to a teacher training program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1982.

Espeseth, V. K. Changes in teacher-education practices as a function of P.L. 94-142 (Pilot Study). University of Oregon, April 1982.

Gage, N. L. The yield of research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 229-235.

Gazvoda, M. W. A preliminary study of the clusters of capability. In The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1980.

Haisley, F. B. Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student Resource Guide in Elementary Education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Haisley, F. B., & Hazelhurst, R. An evaluation of elementary education majors. Unpublished manuscript, University of Oregon, 1979.

Harrison, M. (Ed.). Philosophical position on mainstreaming of the applied behavioral studies department. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University. Newsletter--College of Education Dean's Grant, January/February 1981, 2(1).

Hersh, R., & Walker, H. Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. In M. C. Reynolds & J. Brandl (Eds.), Public policy and the special education task for the 1980s: Report of the Wingspread Conference. Policy Studies Review, Special Issue, in press.

Montgomery, M. D. The special educator as consultant. Teaching Exceptional Children, Summer 1978.

Nelli, E. Program redesign in teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(6).

NSSP. Reports of the Dean's Grant Projects: #1 Products of the Deans' Grants. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1981.

Phi Delta Kappan. Reform in teacher education. Special Issue. October 1980.

Preservice training. Mainstreaming Newsletter, October 1981 (1). Gonzaga University, School of Education, Spokane, WA

Rankin, R. J. Relationship between student teaching outcome and selection and process variables. University of Oregon TEEM program. Report to Oregon State Board of Higher Education, 1982.

Reynolds, M. C. Staying out of jail. Teaching Exceptional Children, Spring 1978. (a)

Reynolds, M. C. Basic issues in restructuring teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29(6), 25-29. (b)

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1980. (a)

Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1980. (b)

Rubin, R., & Balow, B. Learning and behavior disorders: A longitudinal study. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 293-299.

Schwanke, D. Admissions criteria in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(6).

Whitmore, J. R. What have we learned from the Dean's Grant Projects? In The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1981.

Table 1

Course Identification for 10 Areas of

Major Content

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

	Major Content Area	Introduced
1.	Awareness and Attitudes	*EPSF 131
2.	Historical, Philosophical, and Social Perspectives	" "
3.	Litigation and Legislation	" "
4.	Service Delivery Systems and Program Approaches	" "
5.	Characteristics of Children with Handicapping Conditions	EPSF 261
6.	Communication Skills, Role Relationships, and Coordination of Resources	EPSF 131 " 362
7.	Assessment in the Classroom	EPSF 362
8.	Adaptation of Curriculum/Materials and Selection of Instructional Strategies	" "
9.	Classroom and Student Behavior Management	" "
10.	Development and Implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP)	EPSF 131 " 362

* EPSF = Educational Psychology and Social Foundations

Source: D. L. Aksamit, M. Wilhelms, & A. Kilgore. Preparing classroom teachers to work with mainstreamed handicapped children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects, Washington, DC, 1981.

TABLE 2

RELATIONSHIP OF COURSEWORK TO PROGRAM GOALS

IEEM PROGRAM UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

ELEMENTARY ED. PROGRAM GOALS	Math 333	Read 335	Read 411	Read 432	Lang 339	Math 407	Media 415	El Cur. 341	SpEd 462	Tch St. I 337	Tch St. II 338	Cl Mgt. 340	Tch Prac I	Tch Prac II	Stud Tch.	Sept. ESCAPE	Exp.
1.0 Instruction																	
1.1 Interpret goals	X		X	X	X	X		X	X								
1.2 Interpret objectives	X		X	X	X	X		X	X								
1.2 Interpret curr progs	X		X	X	X	X		X	X								
1.4 Formulate goals	X		X	X	X	X			X								
1.5 Formulate objectives	X		X	X	X	X			X								
1.6 Design curr programs			X	X	X	X		X				X					
1.7 Develop lesson plans	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	X	X		
1.8 Develop I.E.P.'s	X	X	X	X					X	X		X					
2.0 Selection & Design of Curriculum Materials																	
2.1 Select app materials	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X				X
2.2 Design app materials	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X				X
2.3 Curriculum writing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X					
3.0 Use of Instructional Strategies	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
3.1 Organize classroom for inst.										X		X	X	X	X		
3.2 Design inst prog										X		X	X	X	X		
3.3 Develop tch techniques										X		X	X	X	X		X
3.4 Manage student behav.										X		X	X	X	X		X
4.0 Assessment of Learning																	
4.1 Select tests for diag. of learner	X	X		X	X	X				X		X					
4.2 Design tests for diag. of learner	X	X				X				X		X					
4.3 Use various tests for diag. of learner	X	X		X	X	X				X		X					
4.4 Measure learner progress	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X					
4.5 Make summative eval of learner achieve.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X		
4.6 Select tests for lge-scale assessment						X									X		
4.7 Interpret test scores						X				X					X		
5.0 Personal Growth (Pupil)																	
5.1 Provide career & academic guidance								X				X			X		
5.2 Encourage decision making	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
6.0 Foundation Disciplines																	
6.1 Interpret current Ed practice	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X					
6.2 Improve current Ed practice						X		X	X			X					
7.0 Problem Solving																	
Communicate effectively:																	
7.1 with other faculty								X				X					X
7.2 with administrators								X				X					X
7.3 with parents								X				X					X
7.4 with community								X				X					X
8.0 Professional Growth																	
8.1 Participation inservice										X		X		X	X	X	X
8.2 Membership in professional Ed Assoc.															X		
9.0 Knowledge of Handicapping Conditions									X	X			X	X	X		

Source: F. A. Hainsley. Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student resource guide in elementary education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Table 3

Graduating Seniors Questionnaire Response

Section A

(Mean response achievement ------ , Mean response importance_____)

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5	
1.0 Instruction						
1.1 Interpret goals			3.7			4.1
1.2 Interpret objectives				4.0		4.4
1.3 Interpret curriculum programs			3.4			4.1
1.4 Formulate goals				4		4.6
1.5 Formulate objectives				4.4		4.8
1.6 Design curriculum programs			3.6			4.3
1.7 Develop lesson plans				4.3		5.0
1.8 Develop I.E.P.'s			3	3.7		3.8
2.0 Selection & Design of Curriculum Materials						
2.1 Select appropriate materials				3.9		4.6
2.2 Design appropriate materials			3.5			4.6
2.3 Curriculum writing			3.1			3.9
3.0 Use of Instructional Strategies						
3.1 Organize classroom for instruction			3.5			4.5
3.2 Design instructional programs				3.8		4.5
3.3 Develop teaching techniques				4.0		4.9
3.4 Manage student behavior				4.3		5.0

Table 3 con't

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5	
4.0 Assessment of Learning						
4.1 Select tests for diagnosis of learner		2.5				4.1
4.2 Design tests for diagnosis of learner			3.4			4.2
4.3 Use various tests for diagnosis of learner			3.4			4.2
4.4 Measure learner progress				3.9		4.6
4.5 Make evaluation of learner achievement				3.7		4.4
4.6 Select tests for large-scale assessment		2.8	3.3			
4.7 Interpret test scores			3.2			4.1
5.0 Personal Growth (pupil)						
5.1 Provide career and academic guidance			3.5	3.9		
5.2 Encourage decision-making				3.9		4.4
6.0 Foundation Discipline						
6.1 Interpret current educational practice				3.9	4.1	
6.2 Improve current educational practice				4.2	4.4	
7.0 Problem-Solving						
7.1 With other faculty				3.9		4.4
7.2 With administrators			3.2			4.2
7.3 With parents			3.1			4.1
7.4 With community		2.0				3.7
8.0 Professional Growth						
8.1 Participation in inservice			2.8			3.8
8.2 Membership in professional Educational Association				3.6	3.8	

Source: F. B. Haisley. Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student resource guide in elementary education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Table 4

Items Showing Greatest Disparity between Ratings of Importance and Achievement

	Item	Rating Difference
4.1	Select tests for diagnosis of learner	1.7
7.4	Problem solving with community	1.7

Table 5

Competency Area Ratings by Graduating Seniors

Area		Importance Mean	Difference Xs	Achievement Mean
1.0	Instruction	4.25	.04	4.21
6.0	Foundation Discipline	4.22	.52	3.7
3.0	Use of Instructional Strategies	3.93	-.68	4.61
5.0	Personal Growth (pupil)	3.84	-.31	4.15
2.0	Selection & Design of Curriculum Materials	3.51	-.79	4.30
4.0	Assessment of Learning	3.33	-.83	4.16
8.0	Professional Growth	3.29	-.38	3.67
7.0	Problem solving	2.99	-1.08	4.07

Table 6

Gemeral Evaluation of the Program

	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
Importance of student teaching					4.8
Overall evaluation				4.2	
How prepared are you for teaching?					4.1

Source: Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student resource guide in elementary education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Table 7

Fall 1982

Elementary Education Program

University of Oregon

Student Teacher_____Grade Level_____Term_____

Cooperating Teacher [X] U of O Supervisor [ ]

The Elementary Education student teaching objectives have been stated below. Please rate your student's success in meeting these goals.

5 - outstanding
4 - above average
3 - satisfactory
2 - below average
1 - unsatisfactory

1. Maintains good discipline and control of the classroom.	1	2	(4) 3	(7) 4	(11) 5	(4.32)
2. Provides a physical and social environment suitable for learning.	1	2	(2) 3	(7) 4	(13) 5	(4.50)
3. Identifies and provides for individual differences among students.	1	2	(2) 3	(7) 4	(13) 5	(4.50
4. Effectively does long range planning, unit planning and daily planning.	1	2	(1) 3	(5) 4	(16) 5	(4.68)
5. Achieves desired learning outcomes with pupils through the use of a variety of instructional techniques.	1	(1) 2	(1) 3	(5) 4	(15) 5	(4.55)
6. Evaluates student progress in relation to stated objectives of instruction.	1	(1) 2	(2) 3	(6) 4	(13) 5	(4.41)
7. Interacts with members of the profession in a manner appropriate for a teacher.	1	(1) 2	(3) 3	(2) 4	(16) 5	(4.50)

Overall how would you rate the student as a prospective teacher?

1 2(1) 3(2) 4(4) 5(15) (4.5)

How well has the program prepared the student for the student teaching experience?

1 2(2) 3(1) 4(9)(2) 5(7) (4.14)

Comments: 4.5

Source: F. B. Haisley. Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student resource guide in elementary education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Table 8

Fall 1982

Elementary Education Program

University of Oregon

Student Teacher_____ Grade Level_____Term_____

Cooperating Teacher [ ] U of O Supervisor [X]

The Elementary Education student teaching objectives have been stated below. Please rate your student's success in meeting these goals.

5 - outstanding

4 - above average

3 - satisfactory

2 - below average

1 - unsatisfactory

1. Maintains good discipline and control of the classroom.	(1) 1	(1) 2	(2) 3	(7) 4	(9) 5	(4.1)
2. Provides a physical and social environment suitable for learning.	1	(2) 2	(1) 3	(8) 4	(9) 5	(4.2)
3. Identifies and provides for individual differences among students.	1	(2) 2	(3) 3	(7) 4	(8) 5	(4.05)
4. Effectively does long range planning, unit planning and daily planning.	1	(1) 2	(3) 3	(7) 4	(9) 5	(4.2)
5. Achieves desired learning outcomes with pupils through the use of a variety of instructional techniques.	1	(2) 2	3	(7) 4	(11) 5	(4.35)
6. Evaluates student progress in relation to stated objectives of instruction.	1	(2) 2	(2) 3	(11) 4	(5) 5	(3.95)
7. Interacts with members of the profession in a manner appropriate for a teacher.	1	(1) 2	(1) 3	(5) 4	(13) 5	(4.5)

Overall how would you rate the student as a prospective teacher?

1 2 (1) 3 (1) 4 (8) 4.5 (9) 5 (4.55)

How well has the program prepared the student for the student teaching experience?

1 2 3 4 (13) 4.5 5 (3) (4.22)

Comments:

Source: F. B. Haisley. Training elementary educators for mainstreaming. Student resource guide in elementary education. University of Oregon, September 1978.

Secondary Education: Curriculum and Programs for Teacher Education

Dale P. Scannell

University of Kansas

ABSTRACT. Secondary education programs have achieved only modest success in modifying curricula and assisting faculty members to develop expertise for an effective least restrictive environment curriculum. Even so, Dean's Grant Projects have had some success, and the accomplishments and products could be of significant assistance to institutions at an early stage of program modification. Curriculum modification has included the addition of a course dealing with the characteristics of exceptional adolescents and the implications of Public Law 94-142 for secondary teachers, and the development of materials for assimilation in existing courses. Plans and materials related to faculty development have been produced and field tested by various institutions. Again, these resources are available for institutions that have adopted a least restrictive environment curriculum.

THE requirements of Public Law 94-142 have had unique implications for the preparation of teachers for secondary schools. The challenges have been recognized by the personnel operating Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs); the accomplishments have been more limited than is desirable or even than were hoped for when DGPs were initiated in 1975.

Among the DGPs with secondary education components, the common goals include faculty development and curriculum revision. The challenges for accomplishing these goals derive from the characteristics of secondary education and the preparation programs for secondary education teachers, including

1. the roles and functions of secondary schools;

Dr. Scannell is Professor, Dean of Education, and Dean's Grant Project Director. His recent professional activities have focused on the revision of teacher-education programs to enhance the capabilities of prospective teachers.

SP 023 251

2. the nature of secondary school curricula;
3. the nature of secondary teacher-education programs;
4. the orientation of faculty and students in secondary education; and,
5. the nature of special education services at the high school level.

Role and Function of Secondary Schools

THE appropriate role of secondary education remains a topic of debate among educators, governmental agencies, and the general public. Although the single role of college preparatory institution was rejected many years ago, and even though more than 85 percent of the relevant age group continues in school beyond the mandatory attendance age, a great deal of ambiguity clouds the proper role and functions of the high school. Typically, the enrollment includes students who aspire to higher education and perhaps advanced college degrees, those who intend to continue their education in community colleges or technical institutes, those for whom grade 12 will be the terminal point in their formal education, and those who will withdraw from school before receiving a high school diploma. How best to serve the different needs and interests of such a diverse student population is a question of continuing study and debate and poses a major challenge to teacher-education institutions.

The DGPs that have included components related to secondary education have been required to address the preparation issues arising from the extreme variability of interests, plans, and abilities of secondary school students. Programs for prospective secondary teachers must retain strong components in general education and the subject specializations. The candidates must be prepared to work effectively with academically talented students, students of average and below average ability, and special needs students. The programs must include attention to the characteristics of the latter and to the skills required to work with special teachers. The reality of the secondary school student population and the responsibility of these schools to provide appropriate programs for this diverse clientele pose major challenges for Dean's Grant Projects.

Secondary School Curricula

Whereas elementary pupils spend most of the school day with a single teacher or perhaps two teachers and all pupils study essentially the same subjects, secondary schools are characterized by an elective system and a departmentalized organization. All students are required to meet the same minimum unit requirements in English, science, mathematics, and social studies but they have multiple options in each required field of study. In addition, secondary students typically have classes with four, five, or even more teachers during a given school year.

Secondary teachers commonly meet 100 to 150 students each day. Even when homerooms are part of the organization, the teachers have more limited opportunity than elementary level teachers to develop broad and deep understandings of the students they teach. The organization of secondary schools also limits the ability of teachers to assume responsibility for the total educational and personal development of students. Thus, the realities of the secondary curriculum and the attendant school organization have created major challenges for DGPs.

Secondary Teacher-Education Programs

TEACHER-education programs for prospective secondary school

teachers are characterized by strong emphases on general education and teaching field specialization. Concomitantly, they have been seriously limited in terms of the fields undergirding professional education and in pedagogical coursework. The requirements of Public Law 94-142 impinge on the undergirding disciplines and pedagogy.

A major challenge to DGPs has been to find a way to include appropriate attention to learning and human development, assessment, curriculum development, and other topics that are germane to education in a least restrictive environment. An already crowded program provides little time for the addition or expansion of topics in a seriously restricted professional education component.

An additional problem in secondary teacher-education programs mirrors the curriculum and organization features of high schools. Programs for elementary teachers are relatively common to all students; programs for prospective secondary teachers have some common elements but also include courses that are subject specific. Thus, the number of different courses that must be modified and the number of faculty members who must be versed in the principles of Public Law 94-142 are large.

The Orientation of Faculty Members and Students

Secondary teachers have been described by many writers as subject-centered, as compared with elementary teachers who are said to be child-centered. Although both groups undoubtedly share interest in and concern with youth and subject matter, the traditional nature of secondary school and programs preparing secondary teachers seem to place more emphasis on subject-matter mastery than the total development of youth.

Students who elect to major in a secondary education program generally are motivated by their interest in the subject they intend to teach. Professors of secondary education also identify more closely with their specialty than with the nurturance of the total child or youth. If they are asked how teacher-education programs can be improved, most would include the strengthening of subject preparation well above the need to expand or strengthen the pedagogical component.

The nature of the orientation and the interests of secondary education faculty members and students have posed unique and difficult challenges to DGPs. Finding the time for added elements in the curriculum and obtaining and maintaining faculty and student interest in the nature of the least restrictive environment principles have been major deterents to the rapid and thorough accomplishment of project goals.

Secondary School Special Education Services

Historically, the special education services provided at the high school level have been less comprehensive than those provided in elementary schools. In fact, some writers have asserted that special services for secondary school students have been neglected.

Because of this relative dearth of special education services in high schools, school districts have been required to give major attention to developing and/or expanding them, which means, in turn, that teacher-education programs must aim at a moving target. With a limited history to draw on for developing teacher-education programs appropriate to actual school practice, DGPs have been required to base program modification on limited information about and assumptions for the developments in secondary schools that must occur to fulfill the requirements of

Public Law 94-142.

The limited information currently available on the trends and status of the special education services provided in secondary schools is reviewed in the next section. Development of teacher-education programs should be based, at least in part, on the nature of programing for special needs students in secondary schools.

Trends in Secondary Education

ALTHOUGH reports from people who work in or with secondary schools suggest that services for exceptional students have been expanded in grades 9-12, comprehensive and reliable information is not yet available on the nature or extent of special education in secondary schools. However, a study by Carlson provides some data and descriptive information on a selected sample of schools.

The investigation surveyed secondary schools that had been nominated by state directors of special education for providing exemplary services to adolescent students or that had achieved state or national visibility for their programs. The 15 schools were from different regions of the country and represented urban, suburban, and rural districts. The nature of the sample complicates generalization so that the results, perhaps, should be regarded as descriptive of services offered in districts with the most progressive programs for secondary exceptional students. The modal pattern of services is probably less well developed and comprehensive than that found in this survey.

Districts were asked to report the percentage of all handicapped students at the secondary level. Responses varied from 10 to 45 percent with a median of 20 percent. In addition, districts were asked for the percentage of their secondary students who were classified as handicapped, and reports ranged from 3 to 11 percent, with a median of 8 percent. These values may be lower than should be expected on the basis of the percentage of the total student population in grades 9-12 and the expected incidence of handicapping conditions. Although the reason for the discrepancy cannot be determined, several explanations are possible: Districts may have concentrated efforts on providing services in the elementary grades, with the provision of services expanding for the younger age groups as they proceeded through school. Handicapped students may drop out of school in larger proportions or, perhaps, identification of handicapped children is less effective in the higher grades. Finally, if problems are effectively remediated in the lower grades, fewer students will need special services in secondary schools.

It is interesting, and reassuring, to note that only four schools reported the removal of students from a program of direct instruction at the secondary level, and even in those four the incidence of removal had decreased over time. In most districts the number of students receiving special services at the secondary level had increased. In several the number was stable.

The results of this survey suggest that secondary schools do not have comprehensive programs for identifying students in need of special services. Districts generally rely on identifications that have been made in earlier grades. Referrals account for most students who are identified for the first time at the secondary level as needing special help.

Although classroom teachers participated in IEP conferences most of the time in a majority of districts, the cost of providing substitute teachers for this purpose may become severe as funding decreases. The procedures in these districts suggest

that in the future regular education will be represented by counselors or building administrators.

Parents and students commonly have been part of the IEP team, but in relatively passive roles. Parents have participated more actively in classification and placement decisions but they virtually never participate in decisions on the educational content of instruction for their children.

All districts included in this study offer both academic and life skills or vocational programs. Assignment to the programs has not been based on student need. The absence of a regular educator and the limited participation by parents creates a question on how instructional decisions are made. The results of the survey suggest that for students who are judged to need life skills training, this area is given the highest priority and instruction in vocational fields and academic areas is supplemental. However, for students who are assigned to the academic track, priority is given to the units needed for graduation. Instruction is provided directly by a special educator or by tutorial services or the use of consultants.

Schools in the sample generally do not modify graduation requirements for handicapped students. Rather, the IEP frequently is used to modify the way in which graduation requirements are met. A high percentage of handicapped students graduate; the median of the reported figures is 99 percent. Modified diplomas for the handicapped students were reported in use by six of 14 districts. Several factors were noted in the patterns of service to assist handicapped students to meet graduation requirements. (a) The amount of assistance provided was increased; resource rooms or teacher consultants added tutorial or compensatory assistance in required courses. (b) Proportionately less instruction was given in life skills areas, even when such needs were identified.

In sum, it should be noted that reliable, comprehensive information is not available on mainstreaming trends in secondary schools. The information collected from a select group of schools suggests that services for handicapped secondary students are in a state of transition. Programing generally has been successful in assisting students to meet graduation requirements but at the expense of life skills instruction. Although students are provided with services largely in the mainstream, the full application of Public Law 94-142 principles requires continued attention to staff development for regular educators and curriculum modification.

A second source of information on mainstreaming programs in secondary schools is Riegel and Mathey (1980). They reported on seven models in school districts in different states and regions. The variations in these programs, all of which seem to make positive contributions, support the contention that services for secondary school exceptional students are evolving and that the teacher educators who prepare regular teachers should monitor carefully the real world into which teacher-education graduates will enter. Only by knowing the nature of mainstreaming efforts can teacher educators provide programs that will prepare effective teachers for secondary schools.

Despite the major differences among secondary programs for exceptional students, commonalities can provide a reasonable basis for developing programs to prepare secondary teachers. The following list is not exhaustive but it includes important considerations for teacher educators.

1. Classroom teachers must work skillfully with other

adults, parents, and specialists. Consulting skills are required.

2. Fulfilling legal requirements is required of all teachers. The rights of handicapped people must be known.

3. Attitudes are important determinants of effective services. Positive attitudes, based on knowledge of and experience with exceptional youth, are important.

4. Life skills as well as content mastery are important goals for secondary education. Ability to provide or enhance instruction in life skills is essential.

5. Classroom teachers retain responsibility for academic content. They must have the ability to vary classroom management and instructional approaches, and to assess progress.

Accomplishments of Dean's Grant Projects

COMMON goals that were found in the DGPs with a secondary education component were curriculum review and modification and faculty development. Although the objectives varied and were more specific, the activities in general can be subsumed under the two major inclusive goals.

In most teacher-education programs prior to 1975, curricula for prospective secondary teachers included components that were related to human development and learning, educational foundations, methods, and experience in the schools, including student teaching. However, these topics generally did not extend to special needs students, actual experience in working with them, and information on the concepts written into Public Law 94-142. The projects included elements that were related to the discrepancy between the existing curriculum and an ideal curriculum incorporating all elements derived from the law.

Some institutions responded to Public Law 94-142 by adding a course or two on exceptional children; however, most projects added pertinent content to most pedagogically oriented courses. In the latter condition, all content related to the least restrictive environment and the law could not be taught by faculty members trained in special education. Thus, faculty-development activities were undertaken to develop expertise in the individuals who taught courses in the teacher-education sequence which had a special education component.

Curriculum Review and Modification

Major changes in teacher-education programs, such as those required by Public Law 94-142, generate at least three major questions which must be addressed during the process of curriculum review: (a) What new content must be added to the curriculum? (b) How will the new content be assimilated in the curriculum? (c) Who will teach the new content?

Institutions with Dean's Grant Projects used various procedures to determine the content required by the law which was absent from the secondary teacher-education curriculum. In some institutions special education faculty members--those most familiar with special needs students and the process of mainstreaming--were asked to develop a list of needed competencies and knowledge topics. Many institutions drew on information collected from regular classroom and resource room secondary teachers, parents, and state department personnel. The use of an advisory committee representing all of these groups was relatively common.

After an institution had identified the requisite competencies and knowledge, some form of discrepancy analysis was required

to identify which topics were absent in the extant curriculum. This process typically was under the supervision of a committee or task force that included representatives of both secondary and special education faculties. A comparison of the competencies identified in the syllabi of the teacher-education courses with the list of required competencies identified those that were needed but absent.

In some cases the topics germane to a least restrictive environment curriculum were absent entirely; in some cases only modification or extension of the topics was required. For most institutions the first group included the following topics:

- o Legal issues and requirements.
- o The IEP process.
- o Special education services.
- o Referral systems.
- o Community support services.

The following topics commonly were addressed by the extension or expansion of existing topics:

- o The characteristics of exceptional learners.
- o Methods, including analysis, prescription, classroom management, multimethod evaluation, and educational history and philosophy.
- o In-school experiences, including student teaching.

Several lists of competencies have been identified by the DGPs and are available to institutions that are at an early stage of curriculum review. Of particular interest are the lists generated by DGPs at the Universities of Texas/Austin, Kansas, Nebraska, and Maryland.

Methods of Assimilating New Content

Three possibilities exist for the assimilation of new content into a secondary teacher-education program; examples of each approach can be found in the institutions that participated in the DGPs. The strategies include adding a new course (or courses), developing modules for inclusion in existing courses, and a combination of the two. Although a clear pattern has not emerged, the combined approach seems to be gaining in popularity. The creation of a separate course has been the least frequent method for both educational and philosophical reasons.

It was noted in the previous section that many topics required by teachers in schools carrying out least-restrictive-environment programs currently are included in teacher-education programs, and some modification is all that is required. Courses in psychology, development, and measurement are found in virtually all teacher-education curricula, and the addition of appropriate topics or specially developed modules is sufficient. The same is true for institutions that require history and philosophy of education courses.

The information specific to Public Law 94-142, such as legal issues and rights of parents and students, is more difficult to add. Thus many institutions with DGPs have added a course to the curriculum to cover these topics. Such courses have also included topics related to the specific characteristics of exceptional children that are difficult to cover adequately in existing required courses.

For the reasons just noted, many institutions have reached the conclusion, after periods of trial and error, to use a combined approach, adding topics when possible and then creating a new course to cover the remaining topics. There are, however, serious problems with any approach that includes adding a course.

Most secondary teacher-education programs put such heavy emphasis on general education and teaching field specialization that the number of pedagogical courses is quite limited; substituting a new course for an existing one is virtually impossible; and consequently, addition of a course frequently means added hours for completion of degree and certification requirements.

Teaching Assignments for New Content

The approach selected for curriculum modification has a major influence on the decision on which faculty members will teach the new content. When the only modification is an added course, faculty members from special education normally are assigned the responsibility. In institutions that lack a program in special education, a unique problem exists. Consortia have been established to enable a number of institutions to share in staff development activities for existing faculty or the hiring of new faculty members with special education backgrounds.

In the more common situation of assimilating new content into existing courses and/or adding a new course, several approaches have been used. Team teaching has been employed in the foundations and methods courses, and in many institutions some form of faculty development has been instituted so regular education faculty members could assume responsibility for the new content. Institutions have reported varying degrees of success in these activities but they believe that faculty development is a topic of continuing need and attention.

Faculty Development

The prevailing nature of secondary teacher-education programs and the typical training of faculty members conducting the programs combine to create an important need for faculty-development activities in response to Public Law 94-142. It was noted earlier that the DGPs with secondary education components recognized this challenge and developed strategies that were appropriate for their settings and their secondary education faculty.

Many topics on which development activities centered were common to most projects. The law itself and its implications for secondary schools were topics on which faculty members had little if any background, and thus the topics received primary attention. Characteristics of exceptional adolescents who are placed in mainstream high school classrooms was another topic requiring attention. To some extent every new topic added to the teacher-education curriculum represented a necessary area for faculty development.

In addition to the substantive topics, attitudes toward exceptional students and toward the process of mainstreaming were the focus of many DGPs. There was a belief that these affective factors could impinge on the success of a program both through the messages conveyed to future secondary teachers and in terms of the effectiveness with which new topics were included in the specialized teacher-education courses taught by secondary education faculty members. The goal was to obtain the support of these faculty members for the principles of the least restrictive environment, but, at the minimum, a neutral stance, combined with knowledge of the law, was regarded as essential.

Various techniques have been used to open faculty-development opportunities. Providing financial support for faculty members who wish to learn more about a topic has been one of the most successful. Mini-grants for release time to learn about new topics and revise syllabi and for faculty travel have both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, financial

support is a reward in its own right, but it also enables faculty members to work on topics they believe to be important in their teaching. The limitations derive from the small number of faculty members who can be reached by such supports, and for institutions with serious budget constraints, this strategy is not even feasible.

Almost all the DGPs engaged in the development or expansion of library and media resources that were related in some way to mainstreaming and Public Law 94-142. Projects commonly distributed lists of new acquisitions to faculty members. In some institutions multiple copies of important documents were obtained and distributed to faculty members.

In the previous section on curriculum, team teaching was mentioned as one approach to handling new content in secondary education courses. In some institutions team teaching was used as a temporary measure with the assumption that it also was a faculty-development activity for regular education faculty. The assumption was that after participating in courses with a special educator the secondary education faculty member would be able to assume responsibility for the topics.

A range of other techniques has been used. Seminars on selected topics of general interest to secondary faculty can be offered by special educators. Outside speakers and consultants can be invited to work with secondary faculty members. Secondary faculty members can conduct their own seminars, with topics shared by different individuals. The curricular approach adopted, the nature of the faculty, and the availability of competent resource people should be taken into consideration in establishing a faculty-development program that is appropriate to and feasible for a given institution.

The method followed by the University of Michigan may be particularly appropriate to institutions with relatively large numbers of students per faculty member and a rather limited number of courses in professional education. The Michigan DGP staff decided that flexibility was required in faculty-development activities, thus they focused on broad topics within a specific area of expertise which could be tailored to the needs and interests of individual faculty members.

The approach centers on the use of packets. A packet is similar to a module, in that it provides a complete set of materials about a given mainstreaming issue, but it differs in providing a variety of options. Each packet contains an overview of the topic, suggested activities, a list of readings, media possibilities, a bibliography, and suggested methods for teaching the topic. Each faculty member can choose the materials and readings that are most relevant to her or his needs and the syllabi for her or his courses.

For example, one packet developed for secondary education faculty members is titled, "P.L. 94-142 and the Concept of Mainstreaming." The packet provides a brief overview of the contents and the implications of the law. Then, objectives and prerequisite readings are listed; the readings are included in the packet. Activities are suggested and possible handouts are included. Each activity is described, appropriate media possibilities are listed, and a bibliography is provided.

By studying the packet, doing the prerequisite reading, and teaching the topic, faculty members expand their expertise. Individual faculty preferences are guarded through the variety of activities, media, and references offered.

References

Carlson, S. A. Patterns and trends within exemplary special education programs in the secondary grades. Michigan State University, 1982. (mimeo)

Riegel, R., & Mathey, J. P. Mainstreaming at the secondary level: Seven models that work. A joint product of The Model Resource Room Project (Title IV-C), Plymouth Canton Community School district, and The Making Mainstreaming Work Project (Title VI-B), Wayne County Intermediate School District, 1980.

Key Support Personnel: Administrators, Counselors, Psychologists

Bert L. Sharp

University of Florida

ABSTRACT: Because the roles of educational administrators, school counselors, and school psychologists are essential to the schools' compliance with judicial and legislative regulations, an increasing number of Dean's Grant Projects have begun to direct their activities to the preparation of such specialists. In school administration programs, knowledge of the laws and the acquisition of new skills in the management of personnel and program resources have been emphasized. In school counselor training programs, attention is being given to how training should be revised; and some programs are expanding to two years of graduate study. The future of school psychology in the schools has been under examination since the Spring Hill Symposium, the major national conference held in 1981.

THE key to the success of a child's education is a good teacher. The key to a good teacher is the reinforcement he or she receives from other personnel who understand and support classroom practice. Some of the personnel who provide these services in classrooms, and especially in classrooms in which handicapped pupils are placed, are specialists in reading, mathematics, library materials, speech pathology, special education, counseling, school psychology, and administration. The writers and sponsors of Public Law 94-142 recognized the value of the specialists' work with handicapped pupils when they mandated schools to provide essential support services for children classified as handicapped, which helps teachers to maintain the pupils in mainstream classrooms.

Dr. Sharp is Professor of Education and former Dean of the College of Education (1968-1978) at the University of Florida. The Director of the Dean's Grant Project at the University, he has been the Liaison for the Southern Region (NSSP) and Chair of the NSSP Advisory Council.

SP 023 252

All support personnel should receive training that prepares them well for their roles in the schools. Yet no specialty was given high priority for training grants when plans were made to restructure and improve pre-service education during the mid-1970s, perhaps because the revision of teacher-education curricula was given precedence. Nevertheless, in 1980, five years after the Dean's Grant Projects were in operation, the Advisory Council for the National Support Systems Project turned its attention to the areas of school administration, school counseling, and school psychology and recommended the funding of projects in those areas to insure not only an adequate supply of the specialists but, also, specialists who are well prepared to serve handicapped populations according to today's high standards. A few projects, consequently, have been funded by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (formerly, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped). The work of these projects are examined in the rest of this chapter.

School Administrators

AFTER the enactment of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 and the requirement that it be totally implemented within three years, professional training programs, both inservice and pre-service, were instituted for regular classroom teachers. At the same time, however, practicing school administrators were faced with increased responsibilities: locating, identifying, and enrolling handicapped children and youth, insuring that their schools were in compliance with the rules and regulations adopted by federal and state governments, and providing pupils evidencing a range of handicaps with the educational services they needed in least restrictive environments. This key role of administrators in providing quality instructional programs cannot be ignored.

Not many Dean's Grant Projects, so far, have focused upon the preparation of school administrators. However, as schools, colleges, and departments of education continue to up-grade the preparation of school personnel, more attention probably will be given to the training of administrators. In the current projects, the modifications in curricula are similar in part to those developed for the revised preparation of classroom teachers. Essentially, the modifications for administrators are the integration in the training programs of knowledge of the law and rights of students and parents, and the acquisition of skills in the management of faculty members, facilities, and resources to promote compliance with legislation and the development of successful classroom programs. In some institutions, a new course on the administration of special education programs has been added.

Examples of revised preparation programs for school administrators which were developed with the aid of Deans' Grants are the programs being conducted at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (1981) and Cleveland State University (1982).

Teachers College, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The project staff and faculty members of the Educational Administration Unit identified four curriculum content areas for integration into appropriate courses. Curriculum packets were developed for selective use by faculty members. They include (a) the identification of the content area, (b) the competencies to be achieved, (c) suggested activities for faculty members and students, and (d) the actual materials and resources referred to in the activities for each content area.

The following outline of content areas and accompanying competencies are quoted directly from the programmatic materials.

CONTENT AREA I: TO UNDERSTAND FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS, STATE DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS AND OTHER LEGAL RESTRICTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

o Competency 1: To develop a rationale for recent federal legislation governing the education of students with handicaps.

Activity 1: Use the resources listed in "Landmark Court Cases" (Appendix I.1.1) and trace the development and influence of these landmark court cases on the passage of federal legislation in 1975 P.L. 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

Activity 2: View the 25-minute film, "Those Other Kids," which focuses upon legislative action and a student's legal rights to an education and due process under the law. Use the film's Viewing Guide (Appendix I.1.2) as a focus for discussing/reviewing informational highlights. (The 16mm film is available from the Mainstream Project office.)

Activity 3: View the videotape "Educational Alternatives for Handicapped Students; Program 1: Trends." This 30-minute videotape focuses on the historical evolution of the handicapped and relevant legislation, outlining the school's responsibility for the educational program. (The 3/4" videotape is available from the Mainstream Project office.)

Activity 4: Listen to the cassette tape by Thomas Gilhool, "The Right to Education," produced by The Council for Exceptional Children. The tape provides an overview of litigation and legislation related to special education services. Use the discussion guide (Appendix I.1.4) to highlight the main parts and stimulate discussion. (This cassette is available from the Mainstream Project office.)

o Competency 2: To develop understanding of P.L. 94-142 and its relationship to special education programs in the schools.

Activity 1: View the filmstrip series "P.L. 94-142 - The Education for All Handicapped Children Act." The series of three color filmstrips with 20-minute audio cassettes is designed to help educators understand the many facets of P.L. 94-142. The filmstrips are entitled (a) "Introducing P.L. 94-142," (b) "Complying with P.L. 94-142," and (c) "P.L. 94-142 Works for Children." (This series is available from the Mainstream Project office.)

Activity 2: Select and read from several of the articles and publications on the list "Understanding P.L. 94-142" (Appendix I.2.2). These publications are intended to provide regular educators with insight and a better understanding of P.L. 94-142.

o Competency 3: To develop understanding of Nebraska's state legislation, LB 403 and LB 889, and

Nebraska's Department of Education (NDE) Rules 51 through 56 relating to the education of the handicapped student.

Activity 1: Read and review NDE Rule 51--Development of Reimbursable Local Special Education Programs for Handicapped Children--and A Vehicle for Serving Handicapped Students in Nebraska (Appendix I.3.1a), and LB 889 (Appendix I.3.1b). Respond to the handout, "Nebraska's Rule 51: Questions for the Administrator" (Appendix I.3.1), individually or in a group discussion. (Copies of Rule 51 are available from the Mainstream Project office. As of November 1980 proposed revisions to NDE Rules 51, 52, and 54 have been approved by the State Board of Education and are awaiting approval by the Governor and Attorney General of Nebraska.)

Activity 2: Read "Summary of Nebraska Department of Education Rules 51 through 56" (Appendix I.3.2) which summarizes state regulations concerning various aspects of education of handicapped students. Highlight key regulations and relate them to the roles and responsibilities of the building administrator.

o Competency 4: To become aware of other federal legislation affecting the education of the handicapped and their impact on the school's program.

Activity 1: Using the handout, "An Analysis Comparing Federal Legislation Concerning Vocational Education/Rehabilitation With the Education for All Handicapped Children Act," compare and contrast the major provisions, and relate each to the elementary, secondary and adult programs for handicapped students.

o Competency 5: To be aware of the implications of state and federal legislation for teachers and parents.

Activity 1: Use print materials and media resources relating to the education of the handicapped student in the "least restrictive environment" listed in "Implications of the Least Restrictive Environment" (Appendix I.5.1). These materials present background information on current and future trends in mainstreaming. (These are available from the Mainstream Project office.)

Activity 2: Analyze "Case Studies - Providing Services" (Appendix I.5.2). These case studies involve problems that one may encounter in providing services in the least restrictive environment for students with handicapping conditions. Case studies relate to the coordination of the IEP process, identification procedures, responsibilities of teachers, and due process procedures. Based upon an understanding of legislation concerning the education of the handicapped students, solve the hypothetical situations presented in the case studies.

CONTENT AREA II: TO BECOME FAMILIAR WITH CHARACTERISTICS,

IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT PROCEDURES OF THE HANDICAPPED STUDENT AS DEFINED IN NEBRASKA'S RULE 51 AND P.L. 94-142

o Competency 1: To become familiar with handicapping conditions as defined in state and federal laws.

Activity 1: Read "Who Are the Handicapped According to P.L. 94-142?" (Appendix II.1.1), and "What is a Handicapped Child?" (Appendix II.1.1a).

Activity 2: Compare and contrast the definitions of handicapping conditions in P.L. 94-142 (Appendix II.1.1) with Nebraska's Rule 51.

o Competency 2: To become familiar with identification procedures for each handicapping condition.

Activity 1: Analyze "Great Expectations" (Appendix II.2.1) which is composed of case study information concerning four students. Based upon your knowledge of legal descriptions of handicapping conditions, identify the handicapping condition, what predictions can be made for the future of each student--educationally, socially, and occupationally.

Activity 2: Using Nebraska's Rule 51, compare and contrast the identification procedures for the mentally retarded and the learning disabled.

Activity 3: Read Nebraska's Rule 51, section 51(4) concerning the responsibilities for the multidisciplinary staffing (Appendix II.2.3). On the basis of "George Saunders: Case Study," role play a multidisciplinary staffing to determine the most appropriate and least restrictive placement for George.

o Competency 3: To become familiar with program options for each handicapping condition.

Activity 1: View the videotape "Educational Alternatives for Handicapped Students" produced by Nebraska Educational Television Council for Higher Education (NETCHE). Part I focuses on individual conditions and historical perspectives (if background information is deemed necessary). Part II focuses on educational services and referral mechanisms for handicapped children. (The videotapes, 30-minutes each, are available on 3/4-inch cassettes from the Mainstream Project office and from ETV contact, V. T. Miller; the latter source requires 24-hour notice for viewing on City Campus).

CONTENT AREA III: TO UNDERSTAND FINANCING AND BUDGETARY REQUIREMENTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

o Competency 1: To understand basic concepts of how special education is financed in Nebraska.

Activity 1: Read "Financing Special Education in Nebraska" (Appendix III.1.1) which describes the sources of funds for the operation of special education programs.

Activity 2: Invite a staff member of the Special Education Section of the Nebraska Department of Education to guest lecture and answer questions on funding.

o Competency 2: To understand the basic aspects of budgetary requirements for special education.

Activity 1: Read "Special Education Services by Category of Handicap and Level of Program" (Appendix III.2.1) which describes the budgetary requirements of a special education program at the district level.

Activity 2: Using "Case Studies in Least Restrictive Programming," divide the class into small groups and give each group a case study (Appendix III.2.2). Determine if Level I or II services are least restrictive and what programs and services may be necessary to provide a free and appropriate education for the handicapped student depicted in each case study.

CONTENT AREA IV: TO UNDERSTAND THE BASIC IMPLICATIONS OF STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE BUILDING ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

o Competency 1: To understand the administrator's role in the identification and placement of the handicapped student in regard to referral, assessment, multidisciplinary team staffing, and IEP placement meetings.

Activity 1: Read the handout, "The Administrator's Role in Identifying and Placing Students in Special Education Programs," and Nebraska's Rule 51, Development of Reimbursable Local Special Education Programs for Handicapped Children, Sections 51(4), 51(5), and 51(6).

Activity 2: Use the handout, "Checklists" (Appendix IV.1.2), as a guide to coordination of referral, diagnosis, and placement decisions.

Activity 3: Make use of "Case Studies in Diagnosis and Placement." Relate the administrator's role in referring, diagnosing, and placing handicapped students (Appendix IV.1.3).

o Competency 2: To understand the administrator's role in facilitiating appropriate relationships among all personnel involved in instruction of the handicapped student.

Activity 1: Distribute the handout, "Communication" (Appendix IV.2.1), as an introduction to the process of communication among professionals. Then discuss where communication tends to break down and what the building administrator can do to improve the process.

Activity 2: Read "The Administrator's Role in Facilitating Instruction for Level I and Level II Handicapped Students." Compare and contrast the administrator's role in Level I and II programs.

o Competency 3: To understand the administrator's role in facilitating evaluation of special programs.

Activity 1: Read "The Administrator's Role in Facilitating Evaluation of Special Education Programs."

College of Education, Cleveland State University

The Dean's Grant Project recently developed plans for developing seven units in the programs preparing school administrators. These units will appear in a handbook that will state the objectives, key points, suggestions for presentation, activities, suggestions for evaluating students, references and citations for each unit. These seven units and the subsequent objectives for each unit are included here.

I. WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES OF P.L. 94-142, P.L. 93-112 (Section 504), OHIO LAW AND RULES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE HANDICAPPED?

o Objectives

To promote the understanding of federal laws and Ohio laws and how they affect the building principal as well as the school district.

To interpret relevant court decisions and their effects on building and school district policies and procedures.

To become aware of the need to keep abreast of future special education legislation as well as evolving legal decisions.

II. WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S ROLE IN FOSTERING POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN?

o Objectives

To promote effective strategies for increasing acceptance of handicapped students by faculty, staff, and nonhandicapped students.

To develop effective inservice training for all school staff so that mainstreaming can be implemented effectively.

To develop strategies for sharing information with parents/community and generating support for the integration of exceptional children into the regular classroom.

III. HOW CAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS BEST USE THEIR TIME IN ORGANIZING AND CREATING POSITIVE CONDITIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING P.L. 94-142?

o Objectives

To understand the management team concept and how it can be used to foster the organizational climate necessary to implement P.L. 94-142.

To understand the principal's role in implementing P.L. 94-142.

To develop a conceptual framework for school administrators to use in organizing personnel and facilities in order to maximize the educational opportunities of the handicapped.

To understand the time management studies and techniques in order to achieve optimum outputs within time constraints of school administrators.

IV. WHAT ARE SOME SPECIFIC ADMINISTRATIVE STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING STAFF AND FACILITIES SO AS TO PROMOTE SUCCESSFUL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMING?

o Objectives

To understand the need for administrative support in the area of partnership between regular education teachers and special education teachers in implementing successful mainstreaming.

To be able to organize a school for mainstreaming by making optimum use of support services and resources.

To develop specific criteria in choosing teachers for mainstreaming, so that those teachers will be most effective in working with handicapped students.

V. HOW SHOULD SPECIAL EDUCATION AND MAINSTREAMING PROGRAMS BE EVALUATED?

o Objectives

To develop effective strategies in developing and monitoring the I.E.P. for each student and its subsequent evaluation.

To develop effective evaluation techniques of teachers involved in each child's I.E.P.

VI. WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR IN THE DUE PROCESS HEARING AND IN REVOLVING CONFLICTS?

o Objectives

To understand the roles and differences of the mediator and arbitrator and how they relate to due process hearings.

To conceptualize mediation in terms of the school setting, especially as it pertains to conflicts with parents, teachers, students, and administrators in providing for the education of the handicapped.

To develop conflict resolution strategies pertaining to the education and integration of handicapped students.

VII. HOW CAN CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING P.L. 94-142?

o Objectives

To present the theoretical background of financing and budgeting school programs.

To know what the law and court decisions mean by "access" for special children in terms of facilities.

To increase community awareness and support of school policies and procedures related to the education of the handicapped.

To become aware of community resources available to handicapped students.

To develop staff inservice programs to help achieve the skills necessary in providing optimum educational opportunities for the special children within the parameters of federal and state regulations and their interpretations.

To understand the school board's role in developing policies necessary in achieving the goal of providing for the education of all children, especially the handicapped.

* * *

Inasmuch as teachers are learning new skills in preparation programs, it is important that the training of administrators make them cognizant of the principles supporting the skills. If teachers are to function as professionals in their roles then increasingly they must have the understanding and support of good administrators.

School Counselors

EFFECTIVE counseling and guidance services are key supports for the appropriate education of handicapped pupils. Most pertinent legislation mandates schools to make such services available for the pupils who require them. Over the last seven years fortunately, the Dean's Grant program has given some attention to revising the training of counselors.

Inservice counselors and guidance workers in Florida and Vermont feel that they need retraining and additional training to adequately serve handicapped pupils (Lombana, 1980; Vanacore, 1980). In general, the investigators reported, counselors believe that they need additional knowledge on handicapping conditions, the personal development of students, career development strategies, assessment, placement of students for appropriate services, consultation with teachers and parents, and counseling with handicapped students.

Given these findings, one is moved to examine the preparation of school counselors. Most have completed one-year MA programs that emphasize techniques of guidance, counseling theory, career development, tests and measurement, organization and administration of guidance programs, and practica, but only one course in each. Courses in human development, psychology, school curriculum, foundations of education, special education, and, in some instances, sociology and anthropology, are optional as a rule. It is possible in some states for school counselors to receive the credential to practice with less than a master's degree, that is, with even less preparation.

The preceding description is accurate for many preparation programs but some notable exceptions can be found at the University of Florida, University of Virginia, and University of North Carolina at Greensboro. They are more specialized and require a minimum of two years' graduate work. Increasingly, colleges are taking seriously the standards for the professional preparation of counselors which have been promulgated by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Analysis of Public Law 94-142 and its implications for what is appropriate education for handicapped pupils, and experience with some Dean's Grant Project personnel, lead to the conclusion that changes are essential if school counselors are to be adequately trained for their roles in working with handicapped children--even all school children and youth.

Lakin and Reynolds, in the chapter, "Public Law 94-142 as an Organizing Principle for Teacher-Education Curricula" in this book, discuss the 10 clusters of capability that should constitute a common body of practice for all teachers (see also Reynolds, Birch, Grohs, et al., 1980). Many if not all the clusters are directly related to the preparation and work of school counselors, given the generalized nature of their roles and practice. The 10 clusters include the following areas: curriculum, basic skills, class management, professional consultation and communication, teacher-parent-student relationships, student-student relationships, exceptional conditions, referral, individualized teaching, and professional values.

Indeed, the findings of both Lombana's and Vanacore's surveys for counselor preparation indicate that five of the 10 clusters are directly relevant to a counselor's work and training. These areas are (a) exceptional conditions, (b) professional consultation, (c) individualized teaching, with particular emphasis on assessment and personalizing services for each individual, (d) teacher-parent-student relationships, and (e) teaching the basic skills that emphasize personal development. In addition, according to the survey results, counselors need more knowledge of various handicapping conditions in relation to career choices and employment opportunities.

To extend the challenge of a common body of practice, the National Support Systems Project sponsored the development of a series of modules for use in programs preparing school personnel (see Lakin & Reynolds, this volume). Two modules are directly related to counselor education: those by Boy (1982) and Sprinthall (1982). Like the other modules, they are oriented to individual assessment and development.

Boy's materials are directed to classroom teachers and offer instruction in how to conduct a program in psychological education that helps students to deal with developmental problems. These would be the normal everyday problems that are part of the personal and social development of all children. It was Boy's intention to design a program that would complement the academic program that teaches children to survive but, also, to live lives that are personally and socially enriching. Teachers would be expected to understand the development of students' mental health and how to integrate this knowledge with academic education. The various approaches to psychological education, for example, rational-emotive, values clarification, and peer counseling, are discussed. Counselors also should be able to conduct such programs, except that their knowledge and skills should be greater in depth than those of teachers.

Sprinthall believes that because teachers are among the students' most important and influential counselors, they should have skills in counseling. The goal of his module is to increase a teacher's ability to identify and respond to emotions and, thereby, to help students to become better communicators with others and self. Students learn about the dimensions of human behavior and thought and they receive training in the skill of active listening.

Many counselor educators may take issue with Sprinthall's idea of training teachers to act like counselors or even with his approach to training. But there should be little dispute over the importance of teachers' recognizing the emotional needs of students as within the bounds of education. Certainly, school counselors share this concern, and their training should reflect it in the content and skills they are expected to acquire.

Common understandings between counselors and teachers can lead each to be more supportive and appreciative of the other's contributions to the mental health of students in mainstream classrooms and enable them to work harmoniously in the psychosocial development of students. For example, counselors can work with peer-counseling groups and they can help all children to develop an appreciation of differences among people, including differences among handicapped students. Because counselors should understand assessment data and psychological reports, they can help to interpret data that would be useful to teachers.

In their position, counselors have ready access to school administrators. This access is a valuable channel for advocating for student needs. People who are knowledgeable about exceptional

conditions and the special needs of learners should be able to collaborate with teachers and other specialists to collect and organize data on the services and programs that are needed by the school's population. Counselors, in fact, are in a unique position to serve as advocates for the special needs of handicapped students.

All counselors spend some time providing direct services when they counsel students with problems. Handicapped students, like their nonhandicapped peers, encounter personal problems as they mature. Thus, counselors need to be knowledgeable about exceptional conditions and to understand their relation to the exceptional students' needs in career and vocational planning. Counselors should be knowledgeable about referral resources and the referral process for other supportive services, for example, assessment of vocational skills attainment, job appraisal, and other habilitative services which may not be offered in schools.

Counselors like teachers often are not prepared to work with other adults. For example, when parents are intimidated by authority figures, a skilled counselor should know how to communicate with them without arousing their fears. Parents of handicapped students often have deep feelings of inadequacy; counselors must have the skills to cope with these feelings. For these parents, counselors can serve in an interpretive and educational role in the areas of human development, special needs of learners, and the system of education. They can conduct counseling sessions for parents and families. A close association with various parent groups can lead to the development of joint activities to serve the needs of parents of handicapped students. To enable counselors to fulfill these functions, counselor education must be restructured to provide the knowledge and skills.

In the early attempts to change counselor training, the strategy employed was to integrate new and additional content into existing course and program requirements. Some programs even adopted one or more new courses in counseling with exceptional children. Adding content to old courses and adopting one or two new courses only works up to a certain point, however. A preparation program should be a coherent course of study. Thus, instead of patching and piecing, it may be necessary to think of lengthening the period of study. Perhaps instead of one year, the preparation of counselors should be extended to two years. Revising counselor preparation programs so that the candidates can acquire the necessary skills and competence to better serve the psychological as well as academic development of children would be consistent with the recent experiences of counselors in practice and the new standards set by professional groups.

In sum, improving counseling skills and competencies to serve handicapped pupils will be equally useful in serving all children. Similar conclusions have been derived from the experience coming out of the Dean's Grant Projects in teacher training.

School Psychology

SCHOOL psychologists increasingly have been pressed into the service of placing children in the special education programs of schools. Laboring under the necessity of complying with legislative regulations and case law, school systems pressured school psychologists into becoming the "gatekeepers" to special services, that is, into using their assessment techniques to determine children's eligibility for special services. It has been estimated that specialists, including school psychologists, are spending upwards of 90 percent of their time in classification and compliance activities and less than 10 percent making deci-

sions on what to do for the children and what kinds of educational programs to prescribe for them. School administrators demand more psychological services in making eligibility decisions whereas teachers and parents would like the school psychologists to provide more support and other direct services. Increasingly, teachers want to know what to do in the classroom and parents want assurance that the outcome will be of high quality.

Many psychologists are not adequately prepared to perform these expanded roles. In fact, there is considerable debate over what school psychologists should do in the schools, which leads to questions on what kind of training they receive. Thus, considerable discussion has focused on school psychology. The Thayer Conference in 1954 and the Spring Hill Symposium in 1981 bracketed a period of intense preoccupation with issues related to the practice, training, and credentialing of school psychologists (Ysseldyke & Weinberg, 1981). Three areas in which school psychologists should be trained to function can be identified.

1. The training of school psychologists has not been given high priority in Dean's Grant Projects. Yet the people in the program hold firm ideas on how the psychologists should function: primarily, as members of support teams for handicapped students. As team members they should spend most of their time providing direct services to students, and support services to teachers and parents in setting IEP goals, selecting strategies to achieve these goals, and evaluating students' achievement. In addition, school psychologists should function as advisors to the school system; they should have the skills and time to advise administrators on how many and what kinds of programs are needed in the schools (rather than on how many students can be deemed eligible for assignment to some predetermined set of programs).

School psychologists have the skills to assess children individually; these skills can be a major contribution to understanding the exceptionalities of learners and the kinds of individualized instructional programs they need. The assessment of pupils should address their instructional needs and lead to instructional decisions. Furthermore, assessment should emphasize current developmental status rather than predictions of developmental capacity. And direct observation to gather data should be encouraged. Such data-gathering techniques are an alternative to the strong dependence of psychologists on standardized testing. The increased use of skills in curriculum-based assessment and evaluation has further implications for the competence and training of school psychologists.

2. Another area in which psychologists should be skilled is the restructuring of classroom environments in order to help teachers and students to develop interpersonal relations that are healthy and conducive to learning. Psychologists can make significant contributions to all students and teachers by bringing about such a climate in classrooms. Fostering communication, acceptance, and appreciation of the differences of members of the group should be a major concern of all the team members.

3. School psychologists should be proficient in initiating and receiving consultation. When one considers the diversity of support persons and resulting services that are brought to bear upon children and their educational programs, it is apparent that skill as a supporting as well as contributing team member plays a greater part in the success of psychologists' work. Communication skills that are effective with other professionals, parents, and students are needed. The work and importance of all team members must be recognized. Relationships must be formed as between coequals. These emphases, if they are practical, hold direct implications for how school psychologists are trained. They suggest

that thorough grounding in learning styles and patterns, in what is taught at various levels, and what kinds of approaches are applicable in meeting the special needs of children, is essential. Because treatment related and highly reliable classifications are essentially nonexistent in many exceptional conditions (e.g., learning disabilities), the importance of curriculum-based assessment techniques is underlined.

If the goal of providing appropriate educational services for handicapped children and youth through age 21 becomes a reality, it can be expected that the vocational education components of many student IEPs will receive greater attention. Questions of vocational skill attainment, career development, job appraisal, and worker competence fall within the purview of school psychologists.

A significant resource in school psychology training is the National Inservice School Psychology Training Network located at the University of Minnesota. The network is a funded project that has developed a series of training materials on (a) the appraisal or assessment process; (b) nonbiased assessment and the issues associated with socio-cultural, language, and legal matters; and (c) non-test-based assessment. The last set of materials suggests alternatives to standardized testing: using psychological skills in interviewing, observation, and assessment of achievement on curriculum objectives. These materials are useful for the pre-service preparation of school psychologists.

When the school psychologist serves as a member of a fully functioning team where each person contributes, and each recognizes that every other member has something equally important to contribute to the study of children, we see clearly the direction in which school psychology and school psychology training programs must move. No one professional unilaterally can make all the decisions that affect a child. There can be no question that school psychology training must be included in the restructuring of training programs.

References

Boy, A. V. Psychological education: Instructional approaches for teachers. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 1982. (Suite 610, 1 Dupont Circle)

Cleveland State University, College of Education. The administrators handbook. Cleveland, OH: Author, in press.

Lombana, J. H. Guidance of handicapped students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1980, 19, 265-275.

Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 1980. (Suite 610, 1 Dupont Circle)

Sprinthall, N. A. Counseling skills for classroom teachers. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 1981. (Suite 610, 1 Dupont Circle)

University of Nebraska, Teachers College. The administrators' roles in the education of handicapped children. Lincoln, NE: Author, 1981.

Vanacore, N. The integration of mainstreaming experiences in counseling program course work and practice - A case study. Burlington, VT: College of Education, University of Vermont, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Weinberg, R. A. (Eds.). The future of psychology in the schools: Proceedings of the Spring Hill Symposium. School Psychology Review, 1981, 10(2). (Whole issue)

Alternative Approaches to Dean's Grant Projects

Elizabeth H. Sakiey

Glassboro State College, New Jersey

ABSTRACT: The background information, goals, strategies, activities, effects, and problems of four Dean's Grant Projects are detailed in this chapter. The four institutions are Furman University, which is relatively small and privately supported, Howard University, also privately supported but medium sized, Portland State University, and Virginia Commonwealth University. The latter two are supported by public funds and are relatively large. Only Furman is located in a rural area. The procedural similarities among the four projects are identified and their differences, discussed.

THE mission of the Dean's Grant Projects is to enhance the preparation programs of personnel who will teach handicapped children and youth in the regular classrooms. The various projects throughout the country have sought this goal in different ways. The four projects described in this chapter also followed different approaches to the same task. Although specific strategies vary from project to project, common directions can be noted in curriculum development, staff development, and evaluation.

CASE STUDIES OF REPRESENTATIVE DEAN'S GRANT PROJECTS

FURMAN University, Howard University, Portland State University, and Virginia Commonwealth University were selected for inclusion in this report by the Regional Liaison Deans because they are representative of the similarities and differences found among

---

Dr. Sakiey is Associate Professor of Reading/Speech Correction and the Curriculum Coordinator of the Project on Mainstreaming. Technical information for and guidance in writing this paper was provided by Janice F. Weaver, Dean of the College of Education, Director of the Project on Mainstreaming, and Liaison Dean for the Northeast Regional Dean's Grant Projects.

SP 023 253

all the projects. For the most part, the projects vary in location, size and organization of the institution, type of personnel involved, scope, and length of time funded.

Furman University

FURMAN University is a small, private institution in Greenville, South Carolina, with a total enrollment of about 3900 students and 140 faculty members. The education curriculum includes undergraduate and graduate programs in elementary, secondary, early childhood, and special education, and graduate programs in administration and reading. Of the 16 faculty members in the Education Department, four are special educators. About 90 pre-service students graduate each year.

Development of the Dean's Grant Project

The PRE-ACT (Preservice Activities) Project evolved out of the identified needs in the state of South Carolina, the School District of Greenville County, and the Education Department of Furman University. The Project was funded first for the 1979-80 academic year and refunded the following two years. The staff consisted of the dean and the project coordinator who devoted 50 percent of her time to the project.

Goals of the Project

The project goals were threefold: (a) to conduct faculty-development activities, (b) to design and conduct an experimental preservice teacher-preparation program, and (c) to disseminate training to other South Carolina and regional teacher-preparation programs.

Activities

Year One. Faculty members' and students' attitudes and knowledge as well as interdepartmental communication and involvement were the focal areas. Specifically, the Stages of Concern (SOC) Questionnaire from Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model was administered to assess the concern of the education faculty with the purposes of the PRE-ACT project. The data collected were used to structure the faculty-development strategies. Awareness and informational seminars were conducted with faculty members. Also, two sets of competencies were developed, one for faculty members and one for students. The faculty competencies pertained only to the common objectives to be achieved by all Education Department members. Each student competency was assigned to a course or courses in order to organize and guide the redesign of the curriculum.

Prior to the Fall term, an overnight faculty retreat was held for all Education Department members. The focus was on human motivation and processes of decision making in the Education Department. The opportunities to communicate openly and work and play together as a department made the retreat a motivating experience for the year that followed.

Release time from one course, on an overload basis, was offered as an incentive for active participation in project activities. The underlying intent was to allow faculty members to identify an educational interest and to relate that interest to some issue in the education of handicapped children and youth. One faculty member, who specializes in children's and adolescents' literature, conducted a library search of children's fictional literature containing handicapped characters and nonfictional books about handicapped children and youth. The outcome was a

comprehensive bibliography which is now used to fulfill one requirement in the "Language and Literature" courses. Other release-time projects have resulted in infusing curriculum into foundations courses, early childhood courses, and secondary methods courses.

Year Two. The SOC questionnaire was readministered. Again, an overnight faculty retreat was offered. This time, the focus was on student competencies and means of restructuring the program. At the end of the second retreat, the faculty unanimously requested to take a "Nature of Exceptional Children" course during the Winter and Spring terms of that year. The course was designed to emphasize on-site visits to special education classes with seminars following the observations. Background readings were provided and compiled into a reference notebook for each faculty member.

On a university-wide scale, an afternoon seminar on awareness of the needs of handicapped college students was offered for administrators, staff members, and resident advisors. A compilation of materials on legal responsibilities and means of accommodating handicapped college students was distributed.

Year Three. The SOC questionnaire was administered again. The annual overnight retreat focused on the refinement of student competencies, collaboration of regular and special education faculty members and students, and audio-visuals to enhance the methods courses. At this retreat, the four special education faculty members were assigned to work with teams of regular education faculty members; they designed meaningful content and experiences to infuse into the regular education coursework, for example, a pilot project in which each special education student was teamed with a secondary methods student. A unit adapted by the student team for a pupil in a regular class was taught by the secondary student teacher.

Finally, to disseminate the knowledge gained about implementing change in teacher-education programs of small colleges or universities, an all-day conference for other state and regional teacher-education programs was sponsored. Also, a consultation team was made available to assist similar institutions in applying strategies for change by sharing human and material resources.

Effect of the Project

Since the inception of the project, interdepartmental communication and involvement have increased, resulting in reconceptualization of the teacher-preparation program, redesign of the preservice teacher-education program, and some university-wide activity. The dissemination of materials to colleges and universities that prepare teachers in the state and region should continue beyond the three-year period.

Several products are available on request: Learning Activity Packets for Secondary Methods Students, a paper on the treatment of handicapped persons in children's literature, programmatic competencies, a Foundation Syllabus, and a paper on storytelling techniques for use with elementary children.

Problems Encountered

In a small program, resources that would permit greater time commitments are often limited. Although given 50 percent release time, the coordinator considered that at least 75 percent was needed to monitor faculty projects and participation and to facilitate development of their release-time products. Other members of the faculty also expressed the need for greater amounts of release time.

Summary

Use of the infused curriculum model by the PRE-ACT Project has brought about change. Evidence can be seen in, for example, the inclusion of new content in old courses, sharing of knowledge, and sharing of practicum sites. However, Furman University is a small institution without a separate Special Education Department; thus the goal of sharing knowledge and resources and of fostering faculty cooperation in general have been less difficult to attain than they would be at a larger university or college with separate departments for special and regular educators.

Howard University

LOCATED in Washington, D. C., Howard University has the largest concentration of black scholars in the United States. About 1,800 faculty members and 10,000 undergraduate and graduate students populate this privately supported institution. The School of Education has 43 faculty members in four departments: Curriculum and Teaching, Educational Foundations, Educational Leadership, and Psychoeducational Studies. They make up the primary target group along with such departments as Child and Family Studies, Physical Education, Social Studies, Art, Drama, and Music Education; and Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and Speech Therapy, which are in other divisions of the university. The schools of Architecture and Planning, Law, Engineering and Social Work are the secondary target group.

Development of the Dean's Grant Project

The three-year project was begun in the Fall of 1979 with a staff consisting of the director, coordinator, and project secretary, and three faculty facilitators from two of the four education departments. Each facilitator provided the liaison among the various departments and the project staff for the needs assessment and faculty development. From the beginning, the dean involved himself in the day-to-day activities of the grant. He also formed an Advisory Task Force to influence the various schools of the university. The task force was composed of the deans of the primary target group or their designees.

Goals of the Project

The primary goal of the project was to bring about significant change in the teacher-education program (pre-K to 12) by including modules on mainstreaming in the curriculum. The reeducation of pre-service and inservice education personnel and other university faculty members engaged in teacher education was another major goal. Other objectives included (a) designing and conducting a comprehensive needs-assessment program, (b) fostering an interdisciplinary approach to implementing the Principles of Public Law 94-142, and (c) maximizing the use of the many human and technical resources at the university and in the surrounding area.

Activities

Year One. A comprehensive needs assessment was designed and administered to ascertain the retraining needs of faculty members. On the basis of the assessment, a series of staff development activities were developed, such as site visits, seminars, and workshops. They were conducted throughout the three-year grant period. Further, to provide more time for staff development activities, modules appropriate to the identified needs were acquired.

In order to gain the participation of other schools and colleges of the university, the Advisory Task Force was established (a) to participate in program and curriculum development, (b) to provide suggestions at the programmatic and evaluation stages of the project (c) to assist in identification of available resources, and (d) to disseminate information on project activities to their faculty and staff members. Moreover, in the Spring, an Exceptionalities Day was sponsored; a number of events were scheduled to attract a wide audience, particularly key administrators. An immediate result was the placing of a braille dictionary and set of encyclopedia in the main library.

Year Two. Site visits, seminars, and the Exceptionalities Day were scheduled again, and the Advisory Task Force was continued. A questionnaire to evaluate students' knowledge and skills in and attitudes toward Public Law 94-142 was developed. Also, a series of five beginners' sign language workshops was offered free of charge to university personnel to sensitize them to the needs of handicapped persons. The response was overwhelming.

Year Three. The activities of the preceding year were continued. The sign language workshops were offered in the spring, this time for both beginners and intermediate students. The goal of modifying curriculum was continued but more effort was devoted to areas outside education. For example, a workshop for the School of Architecture and Planning dealt with designing buildings to meet the needs of handicapped persons

Effect of the Project

As a result of the Dean's Grant Project, the curriculum of the Elementary and Secondary Education programs were redesigned to reflect the intent of Public Law 94-142. Acquired materials and modules were placed in the Instructional Materials Center of the School of Education. Both students and faculty members are now more aware of and responsive to the law and to the needs of handicapped persons.

Communication has improved and expanded within and between the education departments and with other units of the University. Moreover, a handbook on aiding handicapped students was designed and distributed to faculty and staff members throughout the university.

Evaluation was accomplished through the use of a project-developed student-assessment instrument that measures knowledge and skills in and attitudes toward Public Law 94-142. In addition, a student follow-up form was drawn up to permit the monitoring of students at various periods in the program and after graduation.

The faculty needs assessment and an educational survey, "Public Law 94-142: Educating Handicapped Children and Youth," are available.

Problems Encountered

In the School of Education, the influence of the project was the least in those departments that were not directly represented on the staff of the Dean's Grant Project. Project members felt that had these two departments been represented from the beginning, a sense of investment would have developed, more cooperation would have ensued, and the effect of project activities would have been increased. Many faculty and staff members were reluctant to participate voluntarily in activities to bring about change because change was perceived as threatening.

Summary

Rather than "re-invent the wheel," the project staff acquired appropriate modules from universities that already had gained experience in changing curricula to prepare students to educate handicapped pupils in regular classrooms. Thus, more time and energy could be devoted to staff development. Furthermore, the lack of a high degree of participation by the two education departments that were not directly represented on the project staff underlined the principle that people whose roles will be changed by a project must participate in the decisions that will affect them (Reynolds, 1978). This principle was followed in establishing and employing the Advisory Task Force. It was a result of the deans' direct participation that the university-wide activities were so successful. Moreover, it was the involvement of the dean of education in the day-to-day activities of the project that brought about support from faculty members and administrative personnel outside the School of Education.

Portand State University

PORTLAND State University is Oregon's major urban institution; it has an enrollment of about 17,000 students. In addition to programs in the liberal and professional arts, sciences, and business, programs in education up to the doctoral level are offered. In the School of Education, about 970 students and 60 faculty members are in the departments of Teacher Education, Special Education, and Special Programs. The latter offers certification in school administration, counseling, and media.

Development of the Dean's Grant Project

Project REACH (Regular Education Access for Children with Handicaps), which was begun in 1977, was funded for two three-year cycles. The project staff consisted of the dean, project coordinator, assistant coordinator, department head of Teacher Education, and the Elementary and Secondary coordinators. Decisions were made on the basis of suggestions from and support of the Community and University Advisory Committees. As the project progressed, the initial roles as change agents of the project coordinator and assistant coordinator altered. They became resource persons in special education while the leadership roles of the department chairpersons and Elementary and Secondary coordinators grew because of the increased faculty participation.

Goals of the Project

The primary goals of evaluation, curriculum development, and faculty retraining remained unchanged throughout the grant period. Initially, the goals centered on (a) developing a process to provide on-going contributions to and evaluation of the preparation practices used in training regular educators to serve handicapped students, (b) designing an early entry program incorporating special education concepts for elementary and secondary majors, and (c) incorporating special education concepts into the professional education courses and preparation programs for administrators and specialists at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In the second cycle, planning and carrying out the plans were continued and extended.

Activities

Cycle One. A list of 39 content areas of education for handicapped pupils (i.e., handicapping conditions and planning and following IEPs) was developed by the project staff, Education Planning Committee, and Community Advisory Committee. Each content area was cross-referenced to all programs in the School of Education. Later, they were synthesized under seven major headings and a chart was drawn up to show each heading and the specific content areas it encompassed.

Two support committees were formed: the Community Advisory Committee and the University Advisory Committee. The first consisted of students, teachers, and school administrators. They drew up a list of exemplary field experience sites, evaluated the project's proposed curriculum content for the education of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms, made suggestions for student-teacher placements, and filed annual reports on the project directions. In contrast, the University Advisory Committee was composed of the heads of the education department, the program heads, and the Elementary and Secondary coordinators. This group sought to increase the university-wide participation of all faculty members associated with teacher education.

From 1979 on, student teachers were asked for their opinions on the infusion in courses of content covering education for handicapped pupils. Moreover, an attitude survey measuring feelings of adequacy was administered each term to student teachers to assess their levels of knowledge and skill in the education of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms. Data also were gathered from elementary and secondary faculty members to find out what content areas on handicapped children they were teaching and what related instructional resources they were using.

Cycle Two. Evaluation and curriculum-change activities were expanded. The Community and University Advisory Committees continued to function. It was during this period that faculty development received greater emphasis. A survey of faculty needs and interests showed that they considered mini-training sessions, team teaching, and observation of exemplary programs in the schools to have high priority. Workshops dealing with methods and materials were scheduled. Individual faculty members were sent to conferences. The Mt. Hood Kiwanis Camp summer training program for handicapped children and youth provided an intensive short-term practicum that allowed selected faculty members and college students to gain practical experience in working with handicapped young people.

In the Spring of 1981, a retreat workshop was held for school administration program faculty members. Community professionals provided information on the content areas for handicapped pupils which they addressed in their curricula. "Plans of action" were drawn up and initiated by project staff members and key teacher-education program coordinators to facilitate the infusion of recommended concepts into education and other University programs. These plans detailed specific goals for departments and outlined associated performance objectives, activities, means of evaluation, and a time frame for each objective.

In the School of Education's Media Lab, a professional resource section was established and the classification system for materials related to handicapped persons was revised. Also, a coordinated curriculum review was undertaken to analyze the scope and sequence of the various concepts taught in the Elementary and Secondary teacher-training programs, with the goal the systematic reorganization of the total education curriculum. Finally, be-

cause evaluation was a major goal, a comprehensive evaluation was made of the process and effect of the training activities and of the overall progress of the project.

Effect of the Program

Communication was increased between the special education and regular education faculty members which resulted in an atmosphere of increased collegiality, cooperation, and sharing of information and resources. A university-wide dialogue was initiated. Faculty members in academic departments began to attend program area meetings and education faculty members were invited to attend academic area meetings. Several evaluations confirmed the general impression that graduating students were more fully prepared to plan, prescribe, and carry out instruction for all types of students. Improved procedures for evaluating all institutional programs evolved from the project. Moreover, a number of new evaluation instruments were developed.

"Plans of action" had a university-wide influence because they brought about the integration of knowledge and skills related to educating handicapped persons into the various professional programs. Not surprisingly, most teacher-education programs made significant gains in incorporating the 39 content areas related to handicapped children and youth into their courses. Because of the Dean's Grant Program, the University's overall response to the intent of Public Law 94-142 was relatively swift.

Several products that were developed by the project are available. They include (a) a report of operations for the first two years, (b) inservice training plans for faculty development, (c) "action plans" for curriculum change, (d) results of the 1979 Far West and South Regional Dean's Grant Conferences on proposed changes in teacher education, and (e) faculty assessment instruments for determining needs.

Problems Encountered

The traditional policy of academic freedom made it difficult for the project staff to institute across-the-board program changes. Some faculty members resisted all attempts to get them to insert new information into their courses. In addition, the fact that teacher education is a university-wide activity meant that program review, evaluation, and modification was a slow and painstaking process, particularly in the area of secondary education. Nonetheless, some progress was made in changing and altering that program. In other departments, however, the amount of program review and modification was limited.

Summary

One component of the management system used by this project was support groups. They were known as the Community and University Advisory Committees and were influential in effecting and guiding the progress of the project. Another important feature was the list of 39 content areas relating to education for handicapped pupils which were keyed to all the programs in the School of Education. Nonetheless, change in some departments and areas of the university came about slowly. It is recognized that attempts to bring about change through gradual infusion is a long-term process. The infusion model works, but it requires far more time than other models, such as instituting a required course.

Virginia Commonwealth University

VIRGINIA Commonwealth University is an urban, comprehensive state-supported institution enrolling about 20,000 students. It has two campuses, the Medical College of Virginia, which consists of 6 academic schools and 4 teaching hospitals, and the Academic Campus, which comprises 6 academic schools, including the School of Education. Twelve baccalaureate and 13 master's degree programs are offered in education; a doctoral program will be initiated in the Fall of 1982. Other post-master's programs in education are conducted jointly with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University faculty members. The School of Education has about 1,200 students and 98 faculty members.

Development of the Dean's Grant Project

Following several meetings at the state level on the implications of Public Law 94-142 for general educators, and after meeting with interested faculty members, the dean of education submitted a grant proposal for a two-year project. It was entered off-cycle and funded for 1978-80. The second proposal encompassed a full three-year funding period (1980-83). In his role of project manager, the dean wrote proposals, made reports, coordinated activities, and supplied administrative support. The project staff also included an administrative assistant and two division heads of the School of Education. Logistical and evaluative assistance was provided by a student assistant. Three small Mainstreaming Development Teams (MDTs), each consisting of one faculty member from special education, two from general education, and a graduate student, were established each year. With other key personnel, the MDTs functioned as an overall project team for curriculum planning and development.

Goals of the Project

The major goals of the project were faculty, material, and program development. Specifically, the project sought (a) to introduce mainstreaming skills, knowledge, and attitudes to pre-service Elementary and Secondary education programs and (b) to extend awareness of and support mainstreaming curriculum modifications to all other teacher-education programs.

Activities

Cycle One. During the two years of the off-cycle grant, pre-service training for elementary teachers was the target. Both faculty-development activities and curriculum redesign focused on specific topics: (a) educational diagnostic procedures, (b) group and individual instructional techniques, (c) knowledge and abilities necessary to implement Public Law 94-142, such as familiarity with IEPs, (d) understanding medical aspects and characteristics of exceptionality, and (e) awareness of referral procedures, community resources, and counseling and career education opportunities.

Each MDT created its own "re-education activity," planned appropriate products, and began modification of the courses with which it was involved. In other words, teams designed, developed, and carried on field evaluations of a series of learning activities that were ultimately incorporated into the pre-service teacher-education program. To aid in developing materials, the Teacher Resources Workshop and the Word Processing Center were

made available to the MDTs.

It should be noted also that in 1979 the School of Education reorganized from a departmental to a division/core faculty schema emphasizing the necessity for intra-specialty teaming. Furthermore, a series of workshops and conferences focusing on the interrelations of education specialists and their reinforcing roles allowed students, university faculty members, and school/agency-based practitioners to come together, interact, and mutually support and extend the project's influence.

Cycle Two. In the third, fourth, and fifth years of the project, pre-service secondary teacher-education programs were the focus. Faculty development and curriculum-design activities were continued. Workshops, conferences, and an all-university film festival were scheduled. Again, MDT teams initiated modifications of courses.

In the final year of the project, all MDTs will examine the progress to date and review the reconceptionalized teacher curriculum. By the end of the five-year project, all components of all programs will have been involved in the curriculum-modification process.

Effects of the Project

Significant progress was made in redesigning and reconceptionalizing the pre-service elementary and secondary education programs as a result of project activities. Interactions among faculty members from different disciplines were initiated, and the sharing of instructional resources, responsibilities, and information increased. Because all components of the teacher-education programs were involved and influenced by the project, faculty interest, support, and degree of participation steadily grew throughout the grant period. Other projects have invited Dean's Grant Project personnel to consult with them, and more than 70 have requested project materials. In addition, 11 papers were presented at professional conferences. Finally, from questionnaires and other evaluative measures, it is evident that first-year teachers' attitudes and satisfaction with pre-service training in teaching exceptional children in regular classrooms have increased.

A significant number of instructional materials have been developed, several of which will appear in professional journals. Fifteen training packets, bibliographies, and monographs also are available.

Problems Encountered

The amount of interaction between special and general educators increased, but there was still a degree of separation between them during this period of renegotiating appropriate professional roles. Not surprisingly, lack of time, conflicting agenda for staff and schools, and diminishing resources made day-to-day activities more difficult. Also, the complexity of mainstreaming itself was a constraint. Although total program modification was well under way, it was not accomplished. Nonetheless, the realization has been heightened that the School of Education must graduate teachers with expanded skills and competencies even though the goal is not yet fully realized.

Summary

The unique aspect of the project was its use of special and general education faculty teams to develop activities related to program modification. In most Dean's Grant Projects, the project

coordinator (usually with a background in special education) designs and arranges a variety of activities to foster staff development and bring about curricular changes. This project differed mainly in that each MDT planned, developed, and field tested appropriate activities for the courses with which they were involved. In general, the teaming arrangement gave special and general educators the opportunity to learn from one another. This was an important phase in the process of renegotiating roles.

CONCLUSIONS

ALTHOUGH differing in size, location, organizational structure, scope, and time length, these representative Dean's Grant Projects were alike in several ways. All listed faculty and curriculum development as goals and either stated or implied that development of materials would evolve from project activities.

Not always set forth as a goal, still, evaluation was an important component of the grants. Some forms the evaluations took were (a) assessments of faculty needs and concerns, (b) questionnaires dealing with attitudes and knowledge of students and faculty, (c) survey measures to determine the extent to which faculty members were incorporating content about exceptional learners into their courses, and (d) follow-up studies of graduates after a year of teaching. Like the representative grants described, the Glassboro State College Project Staff also found it necessary to design and administer a faculty needs assessment to plan appropriate faculty and curriculum-development strategies. Then, to ascertain the effectiveness of project activities, a questionnaire had to be developed and administered to determine increases in students' knowledge of mainstreaming-related information. Another questionnaire was designed to pinpoint how and to what extent faculty members were incorporating the mainstreaming concepts into their courses. The results of these evaluations served as planning guides throughout the grant period.

In addition, all projects focused mainly on pre-service level curriculum modification or change. Nonetheless, the project staffs of Howard and Portland State University focused on both graduate programs and faculty members. At Glassboro, influencing the graduate-education programs came about as a natural progression. The information infused into the targeted undergraduate course "trickled up" into the master's and specialist degree programs. Activities, such as workshops and retreats, for faculty members teaching preservice-level courses attracted graduate faculty members, too. In some cases, a faculty member taught both pre-service and inservice courses and served on curriculum committees at both levels. No doubt, Furman University and Virginia Commonwealth University experienced the same development although it was not specified as a goal or result.

Interestingly, although each school differed in size, Furman, Howard, and Virginia Commonwealth did not have separate special education departments in contrast to Portland State University and Glassboro State College (approximately 12,000 students), which did. Not unexpectedly, when special and regular educators functioned as members of the same department, communication was naturally facilitated. Although all projects reported increased communication and sharing of knowledge and resources, nevertheless the schools with separate special and regular education departments probably benefited most from the grants. This may be due to the few opportunities prior to the inception of the grants for the two groups to come together, nor was that goal generally encouraged.

The representative projects also exhibited unique differences. Howard and Portland State, for example, incorporated support groups in their management organization. At Glassboro State, such groups also were found to be invaluable. These committees were very similar to those in the Portland State project. A Steering Committee composed of faculty members from each department in the Division of Professional Studies and an Advisory Council made up of community representatives, including public school personnel, provided needed contributions and guidance at each phase of the Glassboro project.

Another difference was the systematic approach to curriculum revision. Both Furman and Portland State developed and used lists of competencies. At Furman, one set was designed for faculty members and one for students. Each student competency was assigned to a course or courses to guide the redesign of the program. Similarly, at Portland State, the competencies (the 39 content areas for education of the handicapped), were cross-referenced to all programs in the School of Education.

Furthermore, both Furman and Virginia Commonwealth used teams to attain their goal of curriculum development. At Virginia Commonwealth, the teams were small and made up of both special and regular faculty members; their task was to plan and develop "re-education activities" that would result in curriculum change. In contrast, at Furman special and regular education pre-service teachers collaborated in adapting a unit for a mainstreamed pupil. This activity established a model for pre-service teachers when they functioned as classroom teachers; they would be comfortable in consulting and sharing responsibility with special education teachers.

From this report, it can be seen that different paths were taken by all four projects. Nonetheless, all confronted the same task: to renegotiate the traditional roles of special and regular educators in order to fully implement Public Law 94-142.

Reference

Reynolds, M. C. Some final notes. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Contributors to the descriptions in this chapter were as follows:

Carl, Michael (Dr.), Chairperson of the Teacher Education Department and staff member of Project REACH, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

Howard, Willie T. (Dr.), Dean of the School of Education and Project Director of the Dean's Grant, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Kimmel, Eric A. (Dr.) Curriculum Specialist for Project REACH, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

Morgan, Joy D. (Ms.), Project Coordinator of the Dean's Grant, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Ruch, Charles P. (Dr.), Dean of the School of Education and Director of the Dean's Grant, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia.

Wheatley, Leslie Ann (Dr.), Coordinator of the PRE-ACT Project, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.

The Experiences of Dean's Grant Consortia

Bert L. Sharp

University of Florida

ABSTRACT: Representative of the voluntary organizations of teacher-education institutions which have been awarded Deans' Grants since 1979 are the six discussed in this chapter. They are the Tri-Colleges of Dubuque, Cooperative Dean's Grant Project headed by James Madison University of Virginia, Nebraska Dean's Grant Consortium, the consortium of Historically Black Colleges of Alabama, the Dean's Grant Consortium of Southern and Western West Virginia, and the Multicultural Institute for Change headed by Regis College in Massachusetts. In all six, the major goals are faculty development and changes in the curricula. A number of innovative products have been developed by these consortia.

MAKING developmental funds available to support changes in teacher education programs was a deliberate incentive to deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education to facilitate the implementation of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, in the nation's schools. The funds provided were not of a magnitude to permit awards to all institutions, however. After seven years, only about one-fourth of the more than 1200 institutions that offer teacher-education programs had received some funds.

By 1979, many education faculties were ready to share the experience and knowledge they had acquired through the Dean's Grant program with their colleagues in other institutions. Thus, several proposals for cooperative undertakings were submitted to the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation and were a-

A number of staff members of cooperative projects contributed materials to this chapter, especially the following: Dr. Donna Aksamit, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Dr. Patricia Medieros Landurand, Regis College; Dr. Bess Parks, Alabama A & M University; Dr. Philip Rusche, Marshall University; Dr. Julius Roberson, James Madison University; Dr. Margret Smith, NABSE; and Dr. Sam H. Shout, Loras College.

SP 023 254

warded the essential funds. Some of these cooperative projects are reported on here to illustrate how new knowledge and skills can be shared geographically through close-working consortia. In the examples described, the major goals were faculty development and curriculum changes. They were achieved through the development of individualized institutional plans, dissemination of materials developed by different project staffs, and exchange of faculty members. The descriptions of the projects are based on developed materials which were provided by project staff members.

Tri-Colleges of Dubuque

SINCE 1968 Clarke College, Loras College, and the University of Dubuque in Iowa have had a formalized working arrangement through which they cooperate in teacher education. The arrangement permitted them to develop a single teacher-education program with common programmatic elements, common field experiences, and common scheduling of student teachers in the Dubuque schools; common schedules and calendars were maintained, free intercampus transportation was provided, procedures for faculty exchange set in place, and the cross registration of students permitted. Thus, the three institutions achieved objectives which they could not have attained independently.

The primary goal of the Dubuque Tri-College Dean's Grant Consortia (funded in 1980 for three years) was to develop and conduct a faculty-development program for regular education faculty members so that teacher candidates could acquire the knowledge and skills needed to become effective instructors of mildly handicapped students in regular classrooms.

The major objectives of this goal were as follows:

1. (Year One) To promote faculty development to acquaint Tri-College teacher-education faculty members with the content and implications of Public Law 94-142 for pre-service teacher-education programs.

2. (Year Two) To infuse into the Tri-College pre-service teacher-education curricula the knowledge and skills needed by teachers to work effectively with handicapped students in regular classrooms.

3. (Year Three) To provide practicum experiences that enable pre-service teacher-education students to work with handicapped children in the least restrictive environment.

The intent of the first year activities was to give the teacher-education faculty members the knowledge base that would enable them to make decisions on what curriculum changes were necessary to prepare teachers to work with handicapped pupils in regular classrooms. Thus, a series of three Tri-College Faculty Awareness Workshops was conducted. The subjects were the analysis of Public Law 94-142, the concept of least restrictive environment, characteristics and needs of handicapped students, special problems (IEPs) related to the education of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms, and alternatives and implications for the Tri-College regular pre-service teacher-education programs. Participation in faculty-development activities was open to all faculty members who were responsible for the preparation of students in regular teacher education.

Four departmental and interdepartmental seminars were held to allow faculty members at each college to make a thorough examination of the implications of Public Law 94-142 for their institutions and curricular areas in regular teacher-education programs.

Some of the topics of these workshops were as follows:

- The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education.
- Major Concepts Related to Teacher Education of Handicapped Students in the Regular Classroom.
- Handicapped Children: What are they like? What are their characteristics?
- Materials for Teacher Educators' Use in Training Teachers to Teach Handicapped Students.
- IEP: What it is and what it is not.
- Teacher Competencies.

The format for the second year was similar to that of the first year, except that program emphasis shifted from faculty awareness to curriculum development. Teacher-education faculty members engaged in a study of the competencies that would be required of graduates from the teacher-education program. Decisions were made on curriculum changes and the adoption of content. The determinations for each area were stated in terms of learner performance. The adoption of the new curriculum was scheduled to occur in the Fall term of 1982.

Providing practicum experiences for students to work with handicapped children and youth in the least restrictive environment was the third objective of the project. Faculty members were scheduled to work with classroom teachers, principals, and other school administrators in the selection of sites where student teachers could work with handicapped pupils in regular classrooms.

According to the associate project director, significant accomplishments in faculty awareness led to readiness to make adaptations in course content and experiences. The Dean's Grant Project was accepted by faculty members and institutions as the appropriate vehicle for program development. The level of participation by faculty members in project activities was high: 75 percent or more for all scheduled activities. Forty-eight statements of capabilities have been considered for adoption as requirements in the Tri-Colleges.

Cooperative Dean's Grant Project
James Madison University

THE cooperative Dean's Grant Project is a consortium of 14 small private and state-supported institutions. The project was developed originally for 16 institutions -- two chose not to participate -- that lacked or had extremely limited faculty resources and programs in special education. These institutions were Averett, Bridgerate, Clinch Valley, Eastern Mennonite, Emory and Henry, Hollins, Longwood, Mary Baldwin, Mary Washington, Randolph-Macon, Roanoke, St. Paul's, Shenandoah, Sweet Briar, University of Richmond, Virginia Intermont, and James Madison University. James Madison University was the facilitating organization.

The general goal of the project was to insure the acquisition, by the teacher educators in the different institutions, of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and programs necessary to prepare teacher candidates to work effectively with handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. Hence, assistance in the development of materials centers, securing instructional modules, faculty-development workshops, and institution-specific plans was provided by John Madison University. The agenda for the third and final year (1982-83), included consultation and evaluation of program elements to carry out the institutions' plans and to disseminate information on the products of the coop-

erative Dean's Grant Project.

The Nebraska Dean's Grant Consortium

THE Nebraska consortium comprises eight public and private colleges: Chadron, Kearney, Peru, Wayne, Concordia, Doane, Union, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The overall purpose of the project was to assist the members in effecting significant modifications in their elementary and secondary pre-service teacher-education curricula by using the relevant expertise and materials developed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The ultimate effect will be the transfer of special competencies to the teachers graduating from these institutions which allow them to respond effectively to the needs of handicapped children in regular classrooms. To accomplish this end, two project goals were specified:

Goal 1: To develop a plan for and to institutionalize curricular changes integrating mainstreaming instruction in the teacher-education programs in each of the seven different private and public Nebraska colleges in the consortium.

Goal 2: To provide assistance and training to college faculties in the consortium to increase their knowledge and awareness of issues and approaches in educating handicapped pupils and to strengthen their capability to select, adapt, develop, and use strategies and materials in their teacher-education programs.

The faculty members at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, which, under a prior Dean's Grant, had acquired experience and developed a mainstream curriculum for teacher education, provided support for faculty members at each of the other seven colleges to adapt the mainstream curriculum for teacher education to the particular institution.

Specific objectives and activities have been developed and may serve as examples for other cooperative endeavors.

Goals, Objectives, and Activities

Goal 1: To develop a plan for and carry out curricular changes integrating mainstreaming instruction in the teacher-education program at each of the other seven private and public Nebraska colleges in the consortium.

Objective 1: To identify personnel and establish a process in each consortium college which insures the participation of the respective institution. Deans and faculty members responsible for integrating the mainstream curriculum and representative parents, students, practicing educators, consumers, and other individuals and groups, as determined locally, were involved.

Activities

1. Designate faculty members at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) Teachers College to serve as a Technical Assistance Committee responsible for (a) consultation and collaboration with Curriculum Integration Coordinators and faculty members from consortium colleges; (b) assistance in making available UNL and other Dean's Grant Mainstream Project processes and products to respective consortium colleges; and (c) documentation of UNL post-Mainstream Project accomplishments in mainstream curriculum integration for use, as requested, by consortium colleges.

2. Conduct periodic meetings of respective Curriculum Integration Coordinators and Technical Assistance Committee members to share processes and products and to make decisions and arrangements for technical assistance activities.

Objective 2: To insure that each consortium college designs a plan for the integration of mainstream curriculum which builds upon existing expertise and mainstream activity and which responds to the specific needs of the respective institution.

Activities

Each consortium college, with the assistance of UNL, will

1. conduct planning meetings of the Dean, Curriculum Integration Coordinator, and faculty in each college;
2. conduct needs assessments and opinion surveys of teacher-education faculty members and other personnel in each college who will be involved in the change process and actual curriculum integration, using Dean, Curriculum Integration Coordinators, and Internal Task Force members as key personnel;
3. conduct meetings with the local Advisory Committee to insure involvement and support of handicapped individuals, practicing educators, and consumers;
4. use UNL Project staff and faculty members as needed for consultation throughout the planning phase;
5. develop a plan for identifying mainstream curriculum to be integrated into each teacher-education program;
6. determine the procedures to be used for integrating identified curriculum and define roles of all personnel involved in the integration process;
7. develop a plan for measuring and monitoring the effect of curriculum-integration efforts on teacher-education students for each consortium; and
8. determine approach to be used for documenting on student records their experiences with the mainstream curriculum that is integrated into the teacher-education programs of each college.

Objective 3: To insure the execution of the plan to integrate the mainstream curriculum, which was designed during the planning phase by the respective consortium colleges.

Activities

Each consortium college, with the assistance of UNL, will

1. use results of the needs assessments and opinion/attitude surveys to identify and conduct faculty-development activities on a continuous basis;
2. identify an appropriate mainstream curriculum and document it in an agreed-upon form (e.g., content areas, objectives, competencies, clusters, etc.);
3. identify and select materials/media that are appropriate for curriculum development and integration;
4. incorporate the identified mainstream curriculum into existing teacher-education programs, according to the plan designed during the planning phase;
5. measure the effect of curriculum integration on teacher-education students, according to the plan designed during the planning phase; and
6. enter on records (e.g., transcript, letter of recommendation, etc.) students' exposures to and experiences with mainstream curriculum, which is integrated in to the teacher-education program.

Goal 2: To provide assistance and training to consortium college faculties to increase their knowledge and awareness of issues and approaches in educating handicapped pupils and to strengthen their capability to select, adapt, develop, and use strategies and materials in their teacher-education programs.

Objective 1: To expand the awareness and knowledge of consortium college teacher-education faculties in the philosophical, legal, and instructional implications of mainstreaming.

Activities

1. Conduct awareness and information seminars to enhance consortium college faculties' knowledge of educating handicapped children.
2. Arrange field visits for the faculty members of consortium colleges providing direct experiences with handicapped children.
3. Support the participation of consortium college faculty members in state, regional, and national activities to increase their ability to design mainstream curriculum and instruction.
4. Provide opportunities for consortium college faculty members to become aware of and collaborate with resource personnel who possess the knowledge and skills necessary for the effective conduct of mainstream programs.

Objective 2: To increase opportunities for consortium college faculty members to preview, purchase, and/or develop or adapt material and media resources available in Nebraska and nationally.

Activities

1. Engage in on-going dissemination (by UNL Project staff) of information describing materials and media related to the education of handicapped pupils.
2. Consortium college faculty members will preview and use mainstream materials and media purchased by and available from the UNL Teachers College and other consortium colleges.
3. Consortium college faculty members will preview and use materials and media available nationally, including those from other Dean's Grant Projects and the National Support Systems Project.
4. Provide opportunities for the Curriculum Integration Coordinators and faculty members of the consortium colleges to continuously identify, select, adapt, and use materials/media appropriate for their classes.

Objective 3: To insure the availability to consortium colleges of instructional packets developed by the UNL Dean's Mainstream Project to be selectively used and/or modified by respective college faculty members according to their instructional needs and to provide opportunities for faculty members to develop and share additional instructional packets.

Activities

1. Disseminate copies of existing instructional packets to all consortium colleges upon request.
2. Provide technical assistance in use of instructional packets to faculty members upon request.

3. Collaborate with respective Curriculum Integration Coordinator & faculty members in appropriately modifying and/or updating instructional packets.

4. Assist faculty members in the development of new packets as needs and priorities are identified.

Objective 4: To enhance and expand the mainstream materials/media resources of each consortium college, according to its respective needs as they are identified by faculty members.

Activities

Each consortium college, with the assistance of UNL, will

1. preview and select instructional materials and media related to the education of handicapped pupils for use with curriculum integration;

2. reproduce and disseminate consumable materials as they are needed by faculty, students, and other appropriate personnel;

3. establish a system for dissemination and use of materials and media by faculty members, students, and other appropriate personnel; and

4. use Internal Task Forces of respective consortium colleges to determine needs for instructional materials.

At the end of the second year of a three-year cycle, early results could be identified and some tentative assessments made on the attainment of project goals. They are as follows:

1. The identification of key personnel and the disclosure of their roles at each campus is critical for a consortium project. Time spent by project administrators in getting to "know" key persons is critical to the success of the project. It is "imperative" that there be individualized approaches for working with each person and on each campus.

2. Faculty task forces and external advisory committees were employed at each college. Early conclusions are that those colleges in which contributions from, and involvement of, the two groups are more consistent, are moving toward the goal of curriculum inclusion more rapidly and smoothly. The inclusion of handicapped students and the parents of handicapped students makes the groups more functional.

3. It takes time for consortium members to reach the point when they are ready to call for outside technical assistance. When to plan consortium-wide strategy and when to use an individualized strategy becomes a pervasive problem for project administrators. Communication among key personnel at the local level and among the eight institutions becomes critical. One further note shared relates to the importance of material and media when faculty members begin to develop the curriculum.

4. Even after a short time it is apparent that the consortium is a viable method for bringing about institutional changes in teacher education within a geographical area. The intensive sharing in the process and of products is beneficial to all parties. When institutions learn to cooperate in one project (i.e., the Dean's Grant Consortium), a side benefit is that overall cooperation among the institutions is improved.

Consortium Arrangements Among The Historically Black Colleges

THE historically black colleges have made significant contributions to the training of teachers. Indeed, many black teachers

have been prepared at these institutions. Two projects have been funded that serve more than one campus among the historically black colleges and aim to make available human and material resources for minority educators to benefit the minority pupils with special needs. The National Technical Assistance Center for Teacher Education in Historically Black Institutions of Higher Education toward Implementation of P.L. 94-142 (TAC) was sponsored by the National Alliance of Black School Educators and the Alabama A & M University Dean's Grant Project; both are contributing to the improvement of teacher education on the historically black campus. TAC states that its mission is to strengthen and broaden black institutions in teacher education by providing a model delivery system that is sensitive to the special needs of a minority clientele. The major goals and objectives were as follows:

Goals

1. To increase the pre-service training efforts for the implementation of Public Law 94-142 in historically black colleges and universities.

2. To assist in upgrading the teacher-education leadership in black colleges and universities.

3. To strengthen coordination efforts for affiliated teacher-education programs.

Objectives

1. To expand curricular offerings in the target institutions relevant to the implementation of Public Law 94-142.

2. To improve teacher-education leadership in providing relevant training opportunities.

3. To increase the competencies of regular teacher-education candidates. TAC reported that it conducted training workshops for campus coordinators and for deans. Five instructional modules were developed. The curriculum development modules, the primary training tools, were designed to address the competency needs of regular teacher-education candidates. The titles of the five modules follow:

a. P.L. 94-142 and the Minority Child

b. Minority Handicapped Students: Assessments, Issues and Practices

c. Valuing the Diversity of Minority Handicapped Students

d. Structuring the Learning Climate for Minority Handicapped Students

e. The Development and Delivery of Instructional Services: A Commitment to Minority Handicapped Students

The consortium that includes Alabama A & M and four small private colleges that have no special education programs in central and north Alabama focuses upon sharing the experience of the Alabama A & M Dean's Grant Project. The overall goal was the development of special education competencies in general education majors who are enrolled in pre-service teacher-education programs in participating institutions with limited special education resources. In order to accomplish this project goal, several intermediate objectives were planned.

Objective 1: Professional education faculty members at cooperating institutions will acquire a working knowledge of federal and state special education legislation, appropriate special education terminology, and appropriate special education procedures.

Objective 2: The acquired knowledge will serve as a basis for curriculum revision in the pre-service teacher-education programs at the participating institutions and will be imparted to potential teachers for use in classrooms.

Objective 3: A communication network among institutions will be established and maintained.

Objective 4: A listing of helpful teacher-education resources which are currently available will be prepared and disseminated. This resource list will include the print, media, and service resources that are available in Alabama. Free and inexpensive resources that are available nation-wide also will be included.

Southern and Western West Virginia
Dean's Grant Consortium

EIGHT colleges and universities in southern and western West Virginia who serve many of the needs of 27 rural counties and two major population centers are cooperating to improve their teacher-education programs. The eight colleges are Bluefield State, Concord, Glenville, Marshall University, University of Charleston, West Virginia College of Graduate Studies, West Virginia Institute of Technology, and West Virginia State College. The objectives and strategies used by the project follow.

Objective 1: To develop among college faculty members the attitudes and skills needed to impart concepts, principles, and practices to the education of exceptional children in the least restrictive environment.

Strategy 1.1. A faculty leadership task force was identified by the deans. Considerations for selection include successful college-teaching experience, respect of professional colleagues, receptiveness to the need for curriculum change, willingness to commit time and effort to the project. Additionally, presentation from the certification areas specified in the Project Overview is an important consideration.

Strategy 1.2. A needs assessment was conducted to determine the faculty task force training needs in regard to competencies for performing task force functions.

Strategy 1.3. A topical conference to impart needed competencies relating to Public Law 94-142 and mainstreaming was provided to the faculty leadership task force.

Stragegy 1.4. A workshop to impart needed competencies relating to curriculum development, evaluation, and content-specific training was provided to the faculty leadership task force.

After the first year, the faculty task force will assist in training other faculty members. This training will be provided through an on-going, on-site approach. Some projected task force activities pursuant to this end were as follows:

1. Involvement in the selection and evaluation of media, textbooks, practicum sites, and guest lectures.
2. Organization of instructional packages containing media, suggested activities, and bibliographies of related materials.
3. Identifying and organizing field experiences with exceptional children in public schools and selected state institutions.

4. Demonstrating instructional techniques for teaching mainstreaming skills.

5. Serving on university committees pursuant to compliance with Section 504 regulations.

Objective 2. To design and modify pre-service education and to support service personnel preparation programs to provide for student acquisition of competences related to exceptional children.

Strategy 2.1. An advisory committee with representation from educational agencies and professional organizations, parents of handicapped children, and handicapped persons will be formed.

Strategy 2.2. Current mainstreaming curriculum effort in the eight membership institutions was identified and assessed. (Contribution from the advisory committee was solicited).

Strategy 2.3. An interinstitutional plan for curriculum modification was developed. This plan subsumed intra-institutional plans which will vary in accordance with member-institution needs and resources.

During the first year, project personnel and the faculty leadership task force conducted a programmatic needs assessment and developed plans for change. The curriculum development model, which formed the basis for planning, was that developed by A.E. Blackhurst at the University of Kentucky (used in University of Louisville's Project Retool). This model facilitates planning for systematic curriculum change. The deans (who were on the advisory committee), participated to insure their understanding of and commitment to the plans. At the end of the first year, each institution had a plan approved by the participating university faculty and administration. These plans were to be initiated the following year.

Recognizing the difficulty of obtaining commitment to program change, the following steps have been planned to enhance motivation among university personnel:

1. Public commitment to the generic nature of the proposed change. Although the focus of the project is on the education of exceptional children, the philosophy behind the project is awareness of and respect for the variety of individual differences among children and a humanistic approach to developing educational programs that help each child to develop her/his unique potential. Principles and practices of exceptional child education are useful for the education of all children.

2. Administrative support for faculty involvement. The deans of all participating institutions have committed their support and leadership to their institutions' program-change efforts.

3. Faculty contributions. Broad-based faculty contributions will be solicited in planning change and methods by which change will be accomplished.

4. Incentives for participation. Incentives to participate in program change will include funding to attend training sessions and conferences; support for related activities, such as visits to model mainstreaming sites; increased access to a range of instructional materials and media; and increased opportunities for publication. Course credit for participation in training sessions will be available for faculty members. Members of the participating institutions will also benefit from the informational and technical support offered by the national support sys-

tem for Dean's grants projects.

Objective 3. To establish a communication network for the purpose of identification, development, and dissemination of materials and methods to integrate mainstreaming concepts into the training programs of eight participating institutions of higher education.

Strategy 3.1. Project personnel and faculty task force identify communication and resource needs.

Strategy 3.2. A list of major local mainstreaming efforts and resources is compiled by project personnel.

Strategy 3.3. State and national mainstreaming dissemination systems are identified by project personnel.

Strategy 3.4. A consortium communications network is established by project personnel with input from faculty task force and advisory committee.

Each member institution made an effort to train regular educators in the education of exceptional children. These efforts included special workshops (e.g., integrating exceptional children into the mainstream: a diagnostic prescriptive workshop offered in the summer of 1980 at Bluefield State College). Marshall University developed a required course in the characteristics of exceptional learners for all education majors. Special education faculty members at Glenville State College offered seminars in the methods classes to facilitate general educators' skills in referral procedures, IEP design and execution, and the like. Glenville's Division of Education's Faculty Advisory Committee advocated a proposal to require each teacher-education candidate to schedule two three-hour credit courses relating to exceptional children. One course was designed to teach the characteristics of exceptional children, the other, to teach diagnostic-prescriptive techniques, including IEP development and execution. Most common is the approach used by West Virginia State College; it meets state standards by teaching exceptional child modules in the core courses, such as introductory education, methods, and educational psychology.

All these strategies represent steps toward a curriculum that will adequately prepare regular educators to work with exceptional children; however, the benefits of these efforts can be increased through communication. A systematic means of identifying local efforts, resources, and materials should improve the quality of programs in all the institutions.

The most significant achievements to date reported by the director include the following:

1. Institutional understandings regarding Public Law 94-142 have improved.
2. Faculty consciousness regarding education of special needs individuals has been raised.
3. Goals for improvement of special needs teacher preparation have been identified.
4. Communications between and among institutions have been improved.
5. Long-range planning for delivery approaches have been started.
6. College administrative awareness has been increased.
7. Other institutions in the state, outside the consortium, are seeking information and aid from consortium members.

8. Other types of interinstitutional activities, outside the area of special needs, are being identified.

The Multicultural Institute for Change:
Regis College, Massachusetts

REGIS College has made special its concern with and emphasis on programs in bilingual special education. The project goals are (a) to present to special and regular education faculty members the issue surrounding the education of linguistic minority children with special needs and (b) to provide them with the skills necessary to effect positive changes for linguistic minorities in their training institutions and the local educational agencies where their students intern.

The instructional program in the "Institute for Change" consists of four major components: theoretical modular training, a local educational agency practicum experience, a college practicum experience, and an integrative seminar. For each of three years, the faculty trainees will complete three modules, the correlated local school or agency practica, the college practicum, and the integrative seminar. Prior to initiating any component, each faculty trainee with the assistance of the project staff will undergo a diagnostic prescriptive assessment. Each trainee will analyze his/her particular areas of expertise, background in bilingual/bicultural issues, and favored learning style. In addition, for each task specified in the college component, the trainee will evaluate what he/she has done in that area and develop objectives from a multicultural perspective for self-improvement for achieving that goal. Once these assessments are completed, each trainee, with the help of the Project Director and part-time staff, will develop an individual training plan (ITP) to accomplish each component developed in the "Institute for Change." Techniques, such as individual and school case studies, role playing, group problem solving, and onsight local school, agency and college practicum will be used.

Modular Training

The training modules to be used for each trainee were adapted versions of the courses already developed and taught at Regis College Graduate Division in their bilingual generic special education program and were the vehicles for refining, adapting, following, and evaluating the nine modules with faculty trainees.

Each training module is related to the specific training objectives. The modular training provides the faculty trainee with the theoretical concepts of multicultural special education.

For the training sessions, the staff selected consultants from culturally diverse backgrounds to work on small teams to select goals, objectives, and training strategies for each module. Through a process of intense planning and communication, these consultants worked together to present their skills, knowledge, and perceptions of the field to faculty trainees. The staff feels that this team process, although time consuming and difficult to manage, is important to the success of the project. The multicultural teams have served as role models for faculty members who may not have had many experiences working with educators from culturally diverse backgrounds. Furthermore, this team process enriched the modules by providing diversity that could not be acquired via the use of a single consultant for each module.

Three modules were developed during the 1981-1982 year.[1]

[1] Available from Regis College

They are (a) Multicultural Issues in Special Education, (b) Language and Reading Needs of Linguistic Minorities, and (c) History and Legal Issues in Bilingual/Bicultural Special Education. The first segments of the first two modules will be available on videotape, and training guides are being developed for each tape.

Local Educational Agency Practicum

Each faculty trainee will spend 24 hours or an equivalent of four days in Local Education Agency Practicum experiences that directly correlate with each module. Each faculty member, with the help of the Project Staff, will test out the theory he/she has learned in that particular module and conduct appropriate research and/or development. For example, in conjunction with a module on the Development of Assessment Models, the faculty trainee may select to carry out research in a particular local school on the degree to which assessment instruments are, in fact, biased. A second activity may be to conduct a needs inventory in order to ascertain teacher needs and determine strategies for college personnel to meet those needs.

In addition to selecting the activity, the trainees will select his/her own methodology to arrive at the activity. For example, a trainee may select a practicum experience that requires working directly with a bilingual special education teacher in a particular building or working with a bilingual social worker in a mental health agency. On the other hand, a trainee may choose to participate in a bilingual and special education Parent Advisory Council Meeting, or to become an advocate for a particular linguistic minority student with special needs. Each module will be experienced in a practical way and applied in a practical manner and will involve a seminar to bridge both the theoretical and practical.

College Practicum

Each module is related to four days of the college practicum. The college practicum provides faculty trainees with the opportunity to practice one or more roles associated with the training objectives. The professors will practice these roles as they proceed to accomplish, from a multicultural perspective, the following tasks:

1. Review and evaluate a college program with regard to course syllabi, competencies, training techniques, practicum program, supervision and feedback, and resources.
2. Redesign course(s) in their own subjects.
3. Assist colleague(s) in redesigning their courses.
4. Use money from federal, state, and other sources for program development and training.
5. Develop interdepartmental network(s) in own college.
6. Develop colloborative networks among colleges.
7. Develop and deliver a pre-service course with a multicultural component.
8. Develop college-local school linkages for incorporating real needs and issues in college curricula and providing practica sites for faculty and students.
9. Develop college-state department linkage for carrying our CSPD and using funding.

During the college practicum component phase, the Regis College Project director and staff will work closely with the deans and directors of the participating colleges in order to effect

the needed change.

Integrative Seminars

The faculty trainees participate in three six-hour integrative seminars per year. These seminars are designed to integrate the theoretical learnings from the modules with the practical components of the local and college practica. The seminars consist of sharing local practicum insights on-going log) and applying these learnings to accomplish the needed tasks on the college site. The faculty trainees explore strategies for accomplishing tasks, such as forming networks with other colleges in minority special education, establishing pre-service training models addressing multicultural special education and other issues. In addition, faculty trainees will be given the necessary assistance to perform in their new role of evaluator, designer, consultant, advisor, and proposal writer.

The ITP (Individual Training Plan): An Integration of Training and Experience

Perhaps the most valuable aspect of the Institute for Change is the ITP. Each faculty member, with the assistance of the staff and consultants, has designed experiences that integrate the training with his/her interests, institutional needs, and course content. For the most part, the ITP products can be shared with other faculty members in similar training programs. Furthermore, some ITPs will provide information that can become the basis for redesigning programs.

Summary: Successes and Failures

At the end of the three-year project, the Regis College Institute for Change will provide insights to the strategies necessary for the successful training of faculty members in the content of bilingual/bicultural special education. To date, the Institute staff offers the following suggestions to other institutions who may consider such training:

1. Involve the administrative staff from the beginning of the project. Without the support of the deans, the Institute for Change could not expect high levels of commitment from faculty members.

2. Offer training sessions that do not conflict with faculty members' busy schedules. In most cases, "retreats" provide faculty members with the opportunity to concentrate on the issues and skills relating to bilingual/bicultural special education.

3. Provide experiences in the public schools and community to update the faculty's perceptions of the needs of linguistic minorities in local educational agencies.

4. Be prepared to deal with the attitudes faculty members may bring to the training; attitudes reflect the perceptions of individuals from culturally different backgrounds. Staff members and consultants should have skills in group process, especially as these skills relate to racism and biases that faculty members may consciously or unconsciously possess.

5. Provide on-going follow-up with faculty members and administrative staff. Because faculty members have many responsibilities, their completion of ITPs may be difficult without the constant support of the project's staff and consultants.

Conclusions

THE establishment of consortia is one of the more recent developments of the Dean's Grant program. Most consortia (in 1982) are in the second or third year of their three-year funding cycles. A number of projects provided descriptions and materials for this chapter and some project directors offered opinions on the problems encountered and successes achieved. An examination of all the consortia funded by the Dean's Grant program has led to the recognition that certain principles are operating.

A Common Bond

When members of a consortium have common bonds they have greater chances for achieving success. Examples of common bonds are (a) the cluster of small, mostly private colleges in Virginia with few or no resources in special education; (b) the institutions in West Virginia who, in the main, are in the southern part of the state and are members of the state AACTE; and (c) the tri-college group of Dubuque which has a long-range plan to develop a common or joint teacher-education program.

Prior Consultation

Interinstitutional consultation before designing the consortia project is necessary to establish common goals; the deans and faculty members of each institution should be encouraged to participate in the process in order to increase their commitment, which is necessary for success.

Agenda Building

The agenda of the consortium should reflect the needs of each participating institution and its context as well as those of the campus at which the project is located. Usually, some negotiation and compromise are required. A coordinating committee made up of members of all the participating institutions, which advises and works with the central project staff, is a useful and constructive force.

Key Personnel

On each campus key personnel and their roles must be identified. Individualized methods for working with each campus must be developed by the project staff. Knowing when to use a consortium-wide strategy and when to employ an individualized approach requires wisdom and patience from the project director.

Temporary Structure

Temporary and short-term organizational structures are less threatening to the members of a consortium than are the long-range arrangements. The temporary structures allow participants to exit at points of their own choosing and without threat to their image or status. At the same time, when participants can see the opportunities to enhance their status and image and do not feel threatened, it is easier for them to participate more openly.

Miniature Technical Assistance Centers

Each consortium by its nature can be a miniature technical assistance or support system. All the principles that held for developing the leadership training institutes of the 1960s and

1970s in the range of educational endeavors (e.g., special education, Teacher Corps, bilingual education, etc.) hold here. Consortia function best and most successfully when these principles are recognized and followed. Any consortium in which one institution perceives itself as the source of expertise and knowledge and tries to press them upon others usually creates severe problems in the operations of the consortium.

In sum, success was expected from the consortia, and it is being achieved. The model is replicable but decisions to use it should not be made lightly: Choosing this strategy for change requires that those leading be aware of the principles of operating such a project, as well as the situational context in which it will operate.

Processes of Documentation and Evaluation

Percy Bates

University of Michigan

ABSTRACT: In order to measure the effectiveness of the assumptions of the Dean's Grant Program and of the activities undertaken by the Dean's Grant Projects, evaluations have been undertaken at the individual project, regional, and national levels. The processes of such evaluations are described in this chapter. The evaluation carried out by the Dean's Grant Project at Cleveland State University is described and copies of the forms are appended. Brief descriptions of the regional and national evaluations conducted by the Central Region and Teaching Research, respectively, are also included. A discussion of the relation between documentation and evaluation precedes the examples.

LIKE other recent civil rights legislation, Public Law 94-142 was an attempt to correct the prior wrongs inflicted on the population at which it was directed: handicapped children and youth. So sweeping was the intent of the law that gaps in its provisions were inevitable. One such gap was the absence of a provision for the pre-service training of regular educators to meet the need of handicapped students who were to be placed in the "least restrictive environment," most often in mainstream settings. When Public Law 94-142 was enacted in 1975, few schools of education were prepared to take on the task of modifying their teacher-education

---

Dr. Bates is Professor of Education and Director of the Dean's Grant Project at the University of Michigan, and the Regional Liaison for the Central Region (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin). He served as Deputy Assistant Secretary-Director, U.S. Office of Special Education, 1980-81.

[1] I am indebted to the staff members of Cleveland State University and especially Dr. Mara Sapon-Shevin and Marvin Pasch for their cooperation in supplying the information and materials that are used in this chapter.

SP 023 255

programs to train teachers to work with mainstreamed handicapped students. Changing the status quo would take time and dollars to try innovative techniques to change the institutionalized practices of teacher education.

In anticipation of this resistance, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in 1974 initiated the Dean's Grant program more than a year before President Ford signed Public Law 94-142 into law. A prerequisite to the successful application for funding was the participation of the dean as project leader to assure the project's acceptance in the school. Successful applicants received discretionary funds to begin the task of revising the curricula of teacher-education programs.

The creators of the Dean's Grant program were clear in intent but not in spelling out specific ways in which curricular changes were to occur. In general, grant recipients were expected to modify existing curricula so that long-term benefits would accrue for teachers of mainstreamed handicapped children. In recognition that each school had unique conditions and problems, the initial guidelines afforded considerable flexibility. Clearly, the size and history of the school, the scope of the dean's influence, and other such variables would have to be taken into account in developing the activities of a Dean's Grant Project. At the same time, some similarity among projects could be expected, given that all the institutions shared similar goals and responsibilities in the training of teacher educators and helping local schools to meet the federal mandate.

Feedback after the first grant year gave some evidence that, in many schools, the intent of the Dean's Grant program was being carried out and that changes in teacher-education programs were beginning to form. Other schools, however, reported little or no success. By the end of the first three-year grant cycle, questions that probed the differences between theory and practice began to be raised. Was the premise that the dean was the most influential member of a school of education faculty at fault? Did the dean have the potential to promote curricular reform? Could the Dean's Grant concept actually be effective?

Certainly, there was a plethora of informal testimony to support the grants' effectiveness. Faculty members and deans alike expressed the feeling that the program was working. But hard data was difficult to come by. Thus, given the considerable amount of federal monies invested in the projects, objective evaluation was needed to justify the continued funding of the program. When the second cycle for Dean's Grant funding came around, continuous efforts were made to document the projects' progress.

The Politics of Documentation

AMONG the recipients of Deans' Grants, considerable discussion was devoted to the difference between documentation and evaluation. In general, participants in the projects have regarded documentation as more acceptable than evaluation. Documentation has been viewed as a noncomparative process of describing and substantiating what is actually occurring in the projects. Evaluation, on the other hand, has been regarded as comparative in nature and with the potential to affect the flow of project funds.

Despite continued assurance that the purpose of evaluation was to measure the development of projects, many grant recipients feared that objective evaluation, especially measures of success, would be used as criteria to determine the continuation of funding. Because the Dean's Grant program did not define specific measures of success, many project staff members were wary

of compiling data that could, in essence, be used against them. Consequently, serious evaluative efforts were considerably delayed during the early phases of the projects. However, with much urging from both the Office of Special Education (formerly the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped) and the National Support Systems Project, the need for evaluation was gradually accepted. Although some enthusiasm was generated when project personnel began to evaluate various aspects of their activities, residual concern remained for the acceptance without evaluation of different approaches to change. Despite the great differences in projects and project activities, the similarity among project goals was viewed as a starting point for documentation. What emerged, in fact, was the de facto evaluation process. Assurances were given at both local and regional levels that decisions for funding were the province of the Office of Special Education and regional evaluation would not affect the decisions. Thus, the evaluation process became a test of the Dean's Grant concept rather than of individual project success.

Legally and traditionally, all grant proposals are required to identify the methods by which a project will be evaluated. This requirement assures field readers and the granting agency that sufficient attention will be given to documenting the project's progress and providing a basis, subsequently, for the agency's decision on continuation of funding. This kind of evaluation was not considered threatening because it focused on the project's achievements in the context of its design. However, when the federal agency expressed its interest in evaluations of projects that would reflect the success/failure of the program, many project directors feared that new standards for funding would be initiated. In fact, the OSE was under especial pressure to insure the success of Dean's Grant Projects because these funds, the only monies earmarked for general education, were being looked at with great interest by special educators who felt that "their" allocations were being usurped. Previously, the impetus for the Dean's Grant program came from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, which suggests that individuals in the federal government needed data to monitor the progress of the program and, at the same time, to provide justification for continued funding of the program to the U.S. Congress. Thus, it might be argued that the grantor had a greater need for evaluation of the program's effectiveness than did the grantees.

The Scope of Evaluation

EVALUATION of the work of Dean's Grant Projects has been tried at all levels: local, regional, and national. In its original proposal, each project includes some method for documenting and evaluating its activities. It was agreed at the regional level, however, that these evaluations were primarily for local use and would have little impact on measuring the overall effectiveness of the Dean's Grant program. Therefore, other evaluation approaches were sought.

For purposes of sharing experiences and expertise, the projects were geographically divided by the NSSP into regions, and each region's activities were coordinated by a liaison, who was also a Dean's Grant Project director. Of the 6-8 regions (the number varied from year to year), at least two devoted considerable time and energy to regional evaluation models. In addition, an external group, Teaching Research, was funded in 1980 to develop a model to evaluate the national effectiveness of the projects.

Individual Project Evaluation

Individual projects can conduct what are essentially in-house evaluations. This type of evaluation allows for internal modifications without attracting attention from outsiders, thereby minimizing the risk of being called a failure, which might result in a reduction or elimination of funds. In in-house evaluations, no comparisons are made with the activities or progress of other similar projects. At the same time, the only motivation for carrying out in-house evaluations is to improve the project; sometimes it is a difficult task when staff members invest heavily in project activities. Internal evaluation allows for minor adjustments or a major reorganization with little risk of fiscal loss.

Cleveland State University (Cleveland, Ohio)

An interesting and dynamic internal evaluation was carried out by the Dean's Grant Project at Cleveland State University. Cleveland State is a large urban institution; its College of Education comprises four departments. The Dean's Grant Project focuses on the Department of Specialized Instructional Programs, which includes programs in elementary, secondary, early childhood, "emerging adolescent," and special education, and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, which provides foundational courses for all degree students. The institutional goals of the Dean's Grant Project follow:

1. Faculty Development: The identification and development of attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary for regular education faculty members to incorporate mainstreaming content into their courses.

2. Curriculum Revision and Reformulation: The analysis, development, and modification of undergraduate curriculum in the teacher-education program to include those skills and attitudes that are necessary for teachers to have to provide positive experiences for exceptional children in the least restrictive environment.

3. Field-Site Development: The identification and/or development of mainstream public school settings to serve as field placements for pre-service teachers.

Project Design

Cleveland State's Dean's Grant Project was designed to secure collaboration between special and regular education faculty members in facilitating curricular revisions in the pre-service teacher-education program. This collaboration was accomplished through the development of core courses for all undergraduate teacher-education students. Courses in Sociological Foundations, Psychological Foundations, and Curriculum and Methods were modified and expanded to include (a) information on Public Law 94-142, (b) attitudes and awareness of the needs of handicapped persons, (c) the purpose and development of IEPs, (d) individualized instruction, (e) adaptation of curricular materials, (f) analysis of learner characteristics, and (g) facilitation of social integration.

The early phase of this project focused on the areas of special education, early childhood education, social studies education, and science education. However, as the project progressed, administrators, counselors, and reading and math specialists were added.

The evaluation design (see Fig. 1)[2] encompassed the assessment of project activities in (a) the development of faculty knowledge, skill, and attitudes, (b) changing the curriculum to increase the instructional time devoted to preparation to work with exceptional children and the concept of mainstreaming, and (c) the creation of appropriate field sites. In this design each evaluation objective is paired with one or more data-collection procedures.

Faculty knowledge, skill, and attitudes are assessed through interviews and a content-validation questionnaire (Fig. 2). The combination interview form and questionnaire provides data for monitoring purposes and a record of curriculum revision. It is administered before and after mainstreaming content is inserted into revised courses.

The effectiveness of curricular revisions and knowledge is assessed by the examination of students' grades, by an attitudes and knowledge test administered to the students enrolled in newly revised curricula (Fig. 3), and by the observation of classes. The instrument was the most difficult to create. The problem was to design a measure that would be a valid and reliable barometer of changes in student perspectives which could be attributed to project activities. The first attempt proved to be unworkable because it covered knowledge and attitudes and confounded the "ideal" with the "pragmatic." The present version was used for the first time in January 1981. It is a synthesis of the University of Michigan Attitude Instrument and one recently received from Yona Leyser at Northern Illinois University.

The effect upon students of working in mainstreamed field sites is assessed through the examination of project records and interviews with field teachers and the teacher-education students. The nine items in the "Student Teacher Exit Questionnaire" (Fig. 4) are answered by all teacher-education students when they complete student teaching. The items provide a continuing assessment of the health and vitality of project interventions. Inasmuch as these items are embedded in a college exit questionnaire, which is administered by the Field Service Office, the answers are less likely to be contaminated by transient experiences and personalities.

To evaluate teacher-education students' responses to two revised foundations courses--Social Foundations of Education (EDB 320) and Psychological Foundations of Education (EDB 321)--pre- and post-tests were administered. The pre-tests contain 30 items covering the two courses organized into three 10-item instruments. On the basis of item analysis, seven items from each course were included in its final examination. In addition, some items were chosen for post-testing. Figures 5-A, 5-B, and 5-C show the pre-tests, complete with item analysis data, and the items chosen for post-testing with their item analysis results.

---

[2]All illustrative materials follow the text.

Regional Level Evaluation

In the early years of the Dean's Grant Projects the National Support System annually called one national meeting for all project directors and staff members. At one such meeting and during a small-group discussion, the suggestion was made that grant recipients be organized on a regional as well as national basis. Smaller units, it was observed, would facilitate communication and interaction among the project. would permit project directors and staff personnel to meet more than once a year, and, hence, would increase the availability of support and assistance. Furthermore, the belief was voiced that regional groups would maximize the similarities of projects. As a result, the projects were organized into eight regions: Northeast, Central, Southwest, Southeast, Middle, Far West, South, and Mountains/Plains. The geographic groupings emphasized the similarity of problems among the projects as well as the diversity of projects across regions. It was in recognition of this diversity that an evaluation of a region was undertaken.

Central Region Evaluation

The Central region was made up of 20 schools, colleges, and departments of education from five states: Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and upstate New York. The institutions ranged from public to private, large to small, and teaching-oriented to research-oriented. To add to the diversity, the institutions varied in the number of years their deans had held grants. To make up an instrument that would reflect these variations required both creativity and patience; it was accomplished by a subcommittee of people from the different projects in the region.

After considerable discussion, the planning team members accepted the assumption that the primary focus of the Dean's Grant program was faculty development, with the members of the teacher-education institutions the primary target. At the same time, it was expected that the major variables in the projects would be curricular revisions and course re-design and the increase of students' competencies to meet the needs of handicapped students who would be placed in mainstream classrooms. Particular attention was given to competencies in the following areas:

A. Faculty Competency in areas of
   1. Knowledge
   2. Performance
   3. Attitude
   4. Behavior
   5. Relations
B. Student Competence in areas of
   1. Knowledge
   2. Performance
   3. Attitude
   4. Behavior
   5. Relations
C. Curriculum Re-evaluation and Revision in
   1. Courses
   2. Experiences--field experience
   3. Materials
   4. Structures

With the preceding competency areas as a framework, committee members agreed to ask each project staff to specify their annual goals for each. This method allowed each project to set its own

target and still compare its goals to those of other projects. It was clearly understood that comparisons were intended not for competitive purposes but as self-checks on whether a project was on the "right" track.

Projects then were asked to use a Degree of Attainment Scale for each goal, noting the best to the worst possible outcomes in reaching that year's goal and the level at which they were currently functioning (see Fig. 6). Degrees of attainment were measured on a 5-point scale that ranged from (1) Most unfavorable outcome thought likely through (5) Best anticipated success thought likely. Participants were asked to state the degrees of attainment in behavioral terms. This approach was expected to allow projects to set interim steps of achievement and provide activities that would lead to movement up the scale. It was also thought that the listing of activities would provide an opportunity for the sharing of experience by grant personnel.

National Level Evaluation

Both regional and individual project evaluation have some advantages and disadvantages and both carry some degree of threat to the participants. Usually, the threat stems from the idea of being compared to other projects and the fear of losing funds. Another approach, and, perhaps, one that is less threatening, is to evaluate projects on a national scale. An example of evaluation at the national level was conducted by Vic Baldwin, Bud Fredericks, and Dave Templeman of Teaching Research, a division of the Oregon system of higher education.

Teaching Research National Evaluation

The national evaluation project conducted by Teaching Research differed from other attempts in that all Dean's Grant Projects funded in 1980-81 and all former grants were surveyed. The focus of the evaluation was the review of proposals and the categorization of objectives. This approach proved to be less threatening than direct contact. The reviewers agreed upon the following categories of objectives: (a) awareness and attitude change, (b) curriculum changes, (c) administrative changes, (d) product and material development, (e) student changes, and (f) success of graduates. Following the review of proposals and project summaries, Baldwin, Fredericks, and Templeton developed a questionnaire which was sent to current projects requesting information on the specific Project objectives. Questionnaires on the same areas also were sent to the directors of former projects. The data from the questionnaires were tabulated and common project objectives and levels of progress toward those objectives were ascertained.

The return on the questionnaires from former and current project directors was very good, perhaps because the broad scope (national) of the project as well as the indirect approach to the evaluation process were less threatening than either the local or regional procedures. A national level evaluation also can be more objective than local or regional evaluations if it is conducted by researchers who do not have a vested interest in the projects.

Summary

PROBLEMS tend to arise from attempts to evaluate programs that are federally funded and intended to produce change. In and of itself change is difficult to bring about, but changing institutions of higher education, it has been said, ranks among the most difficult of academic problems.

The Dean's Grant Projects reflected considerable variability. Of course, no two colleges, schools, or departments of education are alike and each has a unique method of operating. In any evaluation plan that compares one institution with others, variability is a critical factor. From experiences with the Dean's Grant Projects, it is clear that an evaluation design must be directed not to the unique operations of the different projects but, rather, to what they have in common: the purposes or basic assumptions. In the case of Dean's Grant Projects, the basic assumption is that the role of dean makes the person holding the position an influential change agent in the institution. It appears, however, that the dean's influence as a change agent is related to the size and history of the school. In general, deans of education in small colleges and universities tend to have considerable influence over the faculty and the change process. In contrast, deans of education in large colleges and universities seem to have little influence and ability to produce change in their units. The most common form of influence in large institutions is found in the collegial model in which change is negotiated by the dean with the faculty.

It has been said that as a result of the grants awarded directly to deans, schools of education will never be the same again. Previously, handicapped children were the subjects of a program in schools of education with which deans were only vaguely familiar. This is no longer the case. As the result of the Dean's Grant Program most deans are now quite familiar with Public Law 94-142 and are very conversant with mainstreaming and special education.

Results from most evaluative efforts (local, regional, and national) indicate that the faculties in schools of education around the country have been actively modifying curricula in order to train teachers in ways of working with pupils who have handicapping conditions and with the specialists who supply special services for such students.

From information to date, the challenge of evaluation to the Dean's Grant Projects has been met at least to some degree; there is evidence that teacher-education institutions have developed a workable concept and that it is moving toward accomplishing its established goal, that is, producing changes in schools of education to turn out regular education teachers with the knowledge and skills to work with students with handicapping conditions. The institutions, however, must continue to demonstrate the effectiveness of their teacher-education programs and to show that we are doing what we think we are doing.

Figure 1

CORE/M

Deans Grant Outcome Evaluation Design

Year I 1980-81

Area of Concern	Evaluation Objectives	Data Collection Procedures
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	When exposed to CORE/M programming, regular faculty in the impacted (sic) curriculum areas (core, early childhood, special education, science and math) will demonstrate growth in:	
	A. project-related attitudes toward mainstreaming and its place in their courses	Pre and Post interviews with faculty
	B. integrating mainstreaming knowledge in existing courses	1. Questionnaire administered before and after exposure to project content Topic / Instruc. Time / Method of Deliv. / Method of Eval.
CURRICULUM REVISION* *Note: During later years, the focus of evaluation will shift from knowledge and attitude change to performance of CSU students in actual teaching situations.	Curriculum activities and modules that focus on some aspect of the education of exceptional learners:	
	A. have been planned and installed into selected courses in the teacher-education curriculum	1. Examination of curricula to determine changes attested to by faculty development questionnaire 2. Observation of classes
	B. are successfully altering teacher-education students' knowledge and attitudes in a positive direction	1. Knowledge examination administered as pre and post test in selected courses 2. Pre-test & post-test attitudes assessed while in core, also in student teacher exit questionnaire
MAINSTREAMED FIELD SITES*	The first stages of a model of collaboration between regular and special education teachers in public schools will be addressed. During 1980-81, the following tasks will be completed:	
	A. Two pairs of teachers who are presently engaged in mainstreaming students and whose performance in this regard is judged to be exemplary will be identified.	Examination of project records
	B. Three seminars for mainstreamed field-site development will be held at CSU.	Examination of project records
	C. CSU teacher preparation students will be placed in the newly identified field-sites. They will work in the mainstreamed process.	1. Examination of project records 2. Interview with field-site pairs and CSU students.
	D. Competencies necessary for mainstreaming will be developed by University faculty and field-site teachers.	Examination of project records
*Note: During later years, the effectiveness of these field sites in the preparation of education students will be assessed.	E. After field-testing of materials judged to be useful in the mainstreaming process--the materials will be used in methods courses.	Examination of project records

Cleveland State University
M. Pasch
8-8-80

Figure 2

Initial Interview _____ Course _____

Follow-Up Interview _____ Date _____
(Check One)

Deans Grant Evaluation
Faculty Interview Form

This instrument has two purposes:

1. To [bring to the] surface faculty attitudes toward the insertion of content about the "mainstreaming of handicapped children" into their courses

2. To determine what curriculum changes are planned and actually implemented

---

1. What are your present impressions/reactions toward the insertion of the Dean's Grant content on "mainstreaming of handicapped learners" into your curriculum?

2. What advantages and/or benefits will your students receive from studying the content on mainstreaming of handicapped learners?

3. What unresolved issues, problems or questions remain in your mind in regard to the inclusion of Dean's Grant content in your curriculum?

Figure 2 (cont'd)

4. What Dean's Grant content topics are presently in the curriculum? (Ex. "Knowledge of PL 94-142," "Attitudes toward children with disabilities," "Knowledge of IEP's") (Enter Answers on Chart)

Topics	Contact Hours	Method/s of Delivery	Method/s of Evaluation

5. How many instructional contact hours are allocated to each topic? (Include both classroom and field hours) (Enter Answers on Chart Above)

6. What methods of delivery are used to teach each topic? (Ex. lecture, reading, field visitation, discussion) (Enter Answers on Chart Above)

7. What method/s of evaluation are used to assess student performance on each topic? (Ex. objective/essay test, paper, field report, check list, oral presentation) (Enter Answers on Chart Above)

8. Which of the topics described in the chart in Question #4 were part of your curriculum before Dean's Grant activities began? How many contact hours were allocated to each topic? (Enter Answers on Chart Below)

Topics	Contact Hours

M. Pasch
8-8-80

Figure 3

Date _____

Course _____

Dean's Grant Student Attitude

Questionnaire

Student Program
(Check One)

A ____Elementary

B ____Secondary

C ____Early Childhood

D ____Special Education (EMR)

E ____Speech & Hearing Pathology

F ____K-12, Art

G ____K-12, Music

H ____K-12, Physical Education

I ____Learning Disabilities/
Behavior Disorders

J ____K-12, Foreign Languages

Figure 3 (cont'd)

Date _____

Course _____

Deans Grant
Student Attitude
Questionnaire

After each of the following statements, circle the response that best reflects your agreement or disagreement. (SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree)

If a separate answer sheet is used, then blacken in the appropriate space with a #2 pencil.

NOTE: Where "handicapped" is used the term refers to children with either or both "mental" and "physical" disabilities.

1. I generally feel that regular students benefit from contact with handicapped students in an academic setting.	SA	A	D	SD
2. With a handicapped child in a regular classroom, there will be an increase in the number of behavior problems to be found among the other children.	SA	A	D	SD
3. In my role as an educator there is little I can do to control whether students make scapegoats out of "mainstreamed" handicapped students.	SA	A	D	SD
4. As a result of placement in a regular classroom, a handicapped child will develop a more positive self-concept.	SA	A	D	SD
5. I am not confident about my ability to provide valuable school experiences for handicapped students in my classroom.	SA	A	D	SD
6. I am confident on my ability to relate to handicapped children.	SA	A	D	SD
7. I am not prepared to be involved in the teaching of handicapped students.	SA	A	D	SD
8. The experience of being in a regular classroom will increase the chances for a handicapped child to attain a more productive and independent place in society.	SA	A	D	SD
9. The presence of a handicapped child in a regular classroom will be a cause for complaints from the parents of the other children.	SA	A	D	SD
10. Most regular teachers will have to alter their classroom physical arrangements and management, if mainstreaming of the handicapped is to be successful.	SA	A	D	SD

12/29/80

Figure 3 (cont'd)

11. I think that the integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom will lower the educational achievement of regular students.	SA	A	D	SD
12. Integration of handicapped students will require most teachers to use classroom time differently and perhaps more efficiently than is now the case.	SA	A	D	SD
13. I look forward to the challenge of working with handicapped children in my classroom.	SA	A	D	SD
14. For their own well-being, I recommend that handicapped students not be placed in regular classrooms.	SA	A	D	SD
15. Integration of handicapped students will require most teachers to learn and use new techniques and materials.	SA	A	D	SD
16. The integration of handicapped students into a regula- classroom represents an opportunity for the regular teacher to grow both personally and professionally.	SA	A	D	SD
17. A handicapped child's academic achievement is likely to be higher if he/she remains in a special classroom.	SA	A	D	SD
18. Handicapped people usually do not make much of a contribution to society.	SA	A	D	SD
19. A handicapped child will likely form positive social relationships with other children in a regular classroom.	SA	A	D	SD
20. Handicapped students are more like normal students that they are different from them.	SA	A	D	SD
21. I am knowledgeable about the learning characteristics and educational needs of handicapped students.	SA	A	D	SD
22. It would be best if handicapped persons would live and work with non-handicapped people.	SA	A	D	SD
23. Having to teach handicapped pupils places on unfair burden on the majority of regular classroom teachers.	SA	A	D	SD
24. I think that the full time special class is the best placement for handicapped students.	SA	A	D	SD
25. Given my current understanding, I believe that "mainstreaming" will benefit me as a teacher as well as all children.	SA	A	D	SD

Figure 4

Dean's Grant Items for Student Teaching
Exit Questionnaire

Likert Scale Items

a	b	c	d
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. For their own well-being I recommend that handicapped students not be placed in regular classrooms.

2. I look forward to the challenge of working with handicapped children.

3. I generally feel that regular students benefit from contact with handicapped students in an academic setting.

4. I generally feel that handicapped students benefit from contact with regular students in an academic setting.

Multiple Choice Items

1. How knowledgeable are you about the learning characteristics and educational needs of handicapped youngsters?

   a. Very knowledgeable
   b. Somewhat knowledgeable
   c. Not very knowledgeable
   d. Not at all knowledgeable

2. How comfortable are you about teaching handicapped youngsters?

   a. Very comfortable
   b. Somewhat comfortable
   c. Somewhat uncomfortable
   d. Very uncomfortable

3. How confident are you about being able to provide valuable school experiences for handicapped children in your classroom?

   a. Very confident
   b. Somewhat confident
   c. Not very confident
   d. Not at all confident

4. How well has your teacher education program prepared you to instruct handicapped children?

   a. The program has prepared me very well
   b. The program has prepared me somewhat well
   c. The program has not prepared me very well
   d. The program did not prepare me at all

5. How well has your teacher education program prepared you to relate to handicapped children?

   a. The program has prepared me very well
   b. The program has prepared me somewhat well
   c. The program has not prepared me very well
   d. The program did not prepare me at all

Figure 5-A

Day Student _____ Fall Quarter, 1980

Evening Student _____

FORM A

Level of Difficulty (LD)
Index of Discrimination (ID)

Dean's Grant

Pre-test--EDB 320/EDB 321

Respond to each item by circling the letter which precedes the answer you believe is correct. Only one answer is correct for each item.

EDB 320 1. The concept of "mainstreaming" specifically refers to which provision of P.L. 94-142?

	PRE		POST	
	LD	ID	LD	ID
(a.) least restrictive alternative	.39	.53	.87	.28
b. free, appropriate public education				
c. zero reject				
d. due process safeguards				

EDB 321 2. The law specifically prohibits identification of a child as being handicapped on the basis of _____ alone. This is the principle of _____ assessment.

	LD	ID
a. tests, subjective	.45	.54
b. I.Q., least restrictive		
c. teacher identification, unbiased		
(d.) I.Q., multi-factored		

EDB 320 3. According to Leo Buscaglia, which is the most accurate statement about the relationship between a disability and a handicap?

	LD	ID
a. Disabilities are by definition the same as handicaps.	.55	.48
b. Handicapped people are typically born, not culturally determined.		
(c.) The tendency to define disabled persons in terms of their limitations can create unnecessary handicaps.		
d. Disability labels are important to the extent that they tell us how best to relate to people.		

FORM A
Page 2

EDB 321

4. The document that is drawn up to define what constitutes and appropriate instructional program for each handicapped child is called:

		LD	ID
a.	a case study	.61	.34
b.	an individualized educational plan		
c.	a personal plan of study		
d.	a learning objectives plan		

EDB 320

5. Which of the following is an area of concern among educators resulting from passage of P.L. 94-142?

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	It may reduce the due process safeguards which presently exist to protect children's rights.	.45	.08		
b.	It may result in isolation of special education students from students in regular classrooms.				
c.	The law is too narrow and simplistic; lacks the potential to produce meaningful change.				
d.	The time required to create and implement I.E.P.'s may actually reduce the time that a teacher spends with children.			.82	.38

EDB 320

6. Whenever people encounter Bill Smith, who is in a wheel chair, they go out of the way to tell him that ever since they saw "Coming Home" they've learned that paraplegics are very sexy people. This is an example of:

		LD	ID
a.	a compliment	.61	.34
b.	handicapism		
c.	normalization		
d.	mainstreaming		

EDB 321

7. Research supports the position that retarded children develop in:

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	unique stages	.45	.60		
b.	the same sequence as normal children				
c.	an isomorphic sequence			.96	.52
d.	no particular sequence				

FORM A
Page 3

EDB 321

8. Critics of I.Q. testing for special class placement note that the tests are:

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	unreliable				
b.	not appropriate for educational placement	.06	.23		
c.	not related to achievement				
d.	culture fair	.72	.49		

EDB 321

9. Research studies indicate that special class placement for handicapped children is _____ regular class placement in maximizing self-concept.

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	superior to	.48	.59		
b.	slightly superior to				
c.	inferior to	.91	.30		
d.	about the same as				

EDB 321

10. Research studies indicate that special class placement for handicapped children is _____ regular class placement in maximizing academic achievement.

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	superior to				
b.	slightly superior to	.19	-.10		
c.	inferior to				
d.	about the same	.52	.58		

Figure 5-B

Day Student _____ Fall Quarter, 1980

Evening Student _____

FORM B

Dean's Grant

Pre-test--EDB 320/EDB 321

Respond to each item by circling the letter which precedes the answer you believe is correct. Only one answer is correct for each item.

EDB 320 1. P.L. 94-142 assures that all handicapped children will be educated in:

		LD	ID
a.	special classes with appropriate support services	.77	.40
b.	special classes as long as annual reviews are held		
c.	appropriate classes at public expense		
d.	resource rooms with children who have similar education needs		

EDB 321 2. The Law P.L. 94-142 specifically prohibits identification of a child as being handicapped based on I.Q. alone. This is the principle of _____.

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	test subjectivity	.43	.37	.89	.57
b.	least restrictive environment				
c.	unbiased assessment				
d.	multi-factored assessment				

EDB 320 3. All of the following are problems with the use of labels EXCEPT:

		PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
a.	Labeling children bars them from special services.	.40	.47	.77	.40
b.	Disability labels often lead to lowered expectations for people.				
c.	Labels such as "mentally retarded" dont't tell us how best to teach a person.				
d.	We tend to artificially group people together on a common label.				

FORM B
Page 2

4. Which of the following is NOT a characteristic of the concept of "handicapism"?

EDB 320

a. Charity drives that promote the image of the disabled as needing pity. LD .60 ID .64

b. Telling the disabled about themselves and their condition.

c. Creating separate environments to meet the unique needs of disabled persons.

d. Treating people with disabilities as being much younger than their chronological age.

5. The concept of "mainstreaming" means, in part, that:

EDB 320

a. special education students should have 100% participation in the regular education program. LD .77 ID .57

b. only those children with "mild" disabilities need have regular education experiences.

c. schools are permitted to decide which youngsters are provided a education at public expense.

d. all children should be entitled to educational experiences in least restrictive environments.

6. The requirements of P.L. 94-142:

EDB 320

a. are inconsistent with previous legislation LD .77 ID .64

b. will be much more costly than providing segregated services

c. include providing gifted students with special classes

d. will require changes in teacher preparation programs

7. The Cascade Model is designed to show that:

EDB 321

a. all children can be served in regular classrooms

b. children should begin in more restrictive environments and move up when possible

c. few children should require the more restrictive educational settings

d. it is most efficient to offer a limited number of educational alternatives

	PRE LD	PRE ID	POST LD	POST ID
	.23	.08	.81	.31

FORM B
Page 3

8. Successful mainstreaming will involve all of the following EXCEPT:

EDB 320

a. working with parents to provide school/home continuity in programming

b. the cooperation of regular class and special education teachers

c. the construction of new special education facilities

d. changing teacher and student attitudes towards exceptional children

	PRE LD	PRE ID
	.76	.28
	POST LD	POST ID
	.94	.38

9. Hiding away retarded children and failing to acknowledge their existence is an example of:

EDB 320

a. remolding

b. mainstreaming

c. exclusion

d. least restrictive alternative

LD	ID
.94	.36

10. Teaching typical children about differences and disabilities is important for all of the following reasons EXCEPT:

EDB 320

a. More knowledge in this area will result in better attitudes towards handicapped classmates.

b. Children are much more prejudiced than adults and therefore need more instruction in this area.

c. Misconceptions concerning the disabled can create problems in mainstreaming

d. An accepting classroom climate is a key factor for successful integration.

LD	ID
.74	.46

Figure 5-C

Day Student _____ Fall Quarter, 1980

Evening Student _____

FORM C

Dean's Grant

Pre-test--EDB 320/EDB 321

Respond to each item by circling the letter which precedes the answer you believe is correct. Only one answer is correct for each item.

1. Which of the following is NOT an important rationale for mainstreaming?

EDB 320

a. Many parents are dissatisfied with the provision of segregated segregated services.

b. Non-handicapped children are deprived if they are not allowed to associate with handicapped children.

c. The effectiveness of conventional special education has been called into serious question.

(d.) Mainstreaming will be less costly than serving children in self-contained classrooms.

	PRE LD	PRE ID
	.50	.24
	POST LD	POST ID
	.57	.08

2. The major difference between a disability and a handicap is:

EDB 320

a. A handicap is a minor problem, a disability is more serious

b. Handicaps are determined by your physical condition; disabilities reflect the person's attitude.

c. Handicaps refer to impairment of sight, hearing and the body; disabilities refer to mental and emotional problems.

(d.) Disabilities are unchangeable; handicaps are created by societal attitudes.

	PRE LD	PRE ID
	.30	.25
	POST LD	POST ID
	.75	.31

3. Which of the following is NOT an example of handicapism?

EDB 320

a. A local bowling alley designates one evening a week for retarded bowlers.

(b.) A lawyer volunteers his time to work with disabled youth.

c. A neighbor tells you that "Blind people have incredible talent for music."

d. Your city airport has stairs but no ramps.

	LD	ID
	.30	.37

FORM C
Page 2

4. Which of the following is the accurate time line of crucial landmarks in the education of handicapped children? (First to latest)

			LD	ID
EDB 320	a.	PARC, Brown vs. Board of Education, P.L. 94-142, Mills	.67	.49
	b.	Brown vs. Board of Education, Mills, P.L. 94-142, ARC		
	c.	P.L. 94-142, Brown vs. Board of Education, Mills, PARC		
	(d.)	Brown vs. Board of Education, PARC, Mills, P.L. 94-142		

5. Which of the following is an expected positive outcome resulting from passage of P.L. 94-142?

			LD	ID
EDB 320	a.	It will decrease the present over-load of school record keeping.	53	.60
	b.	It will simplify the diagnostic and instructional process.		
	c.	It will increase the time regular teachers can spend with children.		
	(d.)	It will increase the opportunity for parents to become involved in planning educational goals for their children.		

6. According to Leo Buscaglia, which is the most accurate statement?

			LD	ID
EDB 320	a.	People with disabilities are largely unaffected by the way society views them.	.83	.24
	b.	How individuals define physical beauty or normalcy will be determined by their own opinions and attitudes.		
	(c.)	The tendency to define disabled persons in terms of their limitations can create unnecessary handicaps.		
	d.	Disability labels are important to the extent that they tell us how best to relate to people.		

7. The case study about the Drifters shows that:

			LD	ID
EDB 321	a.	Children will perform fairly reliably in spite of teacher variability.	.53	.28
	b.	Developing good interpersonal relationships is not associated with improved intellectual functioning.		
	c.	It is impossible to change children who have experienced poor training in their early years.		
	(d.)	Children are very sensitive to changes in their environment and behave accordingly.		

FORM C
Page 3

8. The Individual Education Plan (IEP) must include all of the following EXCEPT:

			LD	ID
EDB 321	(a.)	The student's standardized IQ score	.63	.55
	b.	Short-term and long-term educational goals		
	c.	A description of the extent to which the child will participate in the regular school program		
	d.	A description of how the student will be evaluated		

9. A mentally retarded child has just begun the school year in your class. You would probably try all of the following strategies with the child EXCEPT:

			PRE LD	PRE ID
EDB 321	(a.)	Focus on many target behaviors in one lesson	.50	.38
	b.	Break lessons down into small logical steps	POST LD	POST ID
	c.	Analyze the child's strengths and weaknesses	.83	.44
	d.	Provide additional practice even after the child appears to have mastered material.		

10. Which of the following provides the most extensive integration into the school's regular education program?

			PRE LD	PRE ID
EDB 320	a.	Itinerant special education tutors who supplement regular classes	.40	.24
	b.	Part-time, special day classes along with regular class placement	POST LD	POST ID
	c.	Special education in the resource room with regular class placement	.78	.42
	(d.)	Special education consultative services to the regular class teacher and regular class placement		

Figure 6

School: _____

DEANS' GRANT PROJECTS
CENTRAL REGION

I. Competency Cell: _____ Project Year: _____

II. Specific goal (for this competency cell, for this year):

III. Activities (used to reach this goal for this year):

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

IV. Degrees of attainment (for this goal, for this year):

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

V. Present degree of attainment (where you are now in reaching this goal):

1 2 3 4 5

Central Region Deans' Grants

GOAL ATTAINMENT
(Sample)

We would like each team to formulate three major goals for the project. For each goal we would like you to indicate five degrees of attainment.

Degrees of Attainment

1. Most unfavorable outcome thought likely.
2. Less than expected success.
3. Expected level of success.
4. More than expected success.
5. Best anticipated success thought likely.

Degrees of attainment should be specified in behavioral terms. For example, if you were teaching a course, a goal may be that your students demonstrate competency on your exams.

1. All students have scores of C or below.
2. Test scores positively skewed with few A's.
3. Test scores normally distributed.
4. All students get A's and B's on exam.
5. All students get A's on exams.

Regional Evaluation of Dean's Grant Projects: 1982 Report

Region Evaluation Committee:

Percy Bates, University of Michigan, Central Region Liaison, NSSP
Mary Lynn Boscardin, Data Analysis Section, University of Illinois
Yona Leyser, Northern Illinois University
Philip Lyon, College of St. Rose, Albany, New York
Gayle Mindes, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois
George Olson, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois
Marvin Pasch, Cleveland State University
James Raths, University of Illinois, Champaign
Henrietta Schwartz, Central Region Liaison, NSSP, 1980-81, San Francisco State University

The region was made up of projects in 19 teacher-preparation institutions in 6 states: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, New York (upstate), Ohio, and Wisconsin. Of the 19 projects, 5 were in the first year of operation, 9, in the second year, and 5, from the third to sixth year (3+). The findings of the evaluation are based upon two administrations of the revised instrument in answer to the following four basic questions:

1. In what kinds of activities are Dean's Grant Projects involved?

2. Which activities are successful, and which fail to meet designated objectives?

3. Are there identifiable similarities between Dean's Grant Projects at different schools?

4. What are the components of a successful Dean's Grant Project?

Data Analysis

Two types of analysis were carried out: Completion Status of Activities and Effort Score. All data were reported across three classifications of project duration (1-3+ years) for four major content classifications (faculty, students, curriculum, and organizational structure). The first method, Completion Status, reported the means of the raw responses and the respective percentages in each of four categories (NA--Not applicable, Not started, In progress, and Completed).

The first analysis, Completion Status, reported raw scores in a fraction in which the denominator represents the total number of responses possible for all the projects of a given year and the numerator represents the number of responses selected by those projects. For example, on page 1 of Table 1, the data for "Faculty Objective: Knowledge" show under the column "NA" (Not Applicable) that a total of 30 responses were possible for the 5 first-year projects (i.e., 6 responses per project) but the 5 projects selected 5 of those 30 responses as "Not Applicable." This fraction unfortunately does not indicate how many individual projects selected NA responses. The percentage is derived by dividing the numerator by the denominator (5/30 = 17%). For the second-year projects, of the total of 54 possible responses (6 per 9 projects), the 9 projects selected 11 as not applicable; 11/54 yields 20%.

The Effort Score was generated for each objective (by year)

by weighting the responses selected in each category (activity completed--3; activity in progress--2; activity not started--1; and not applicable--0). The number of responses selected in each category were multiplied by the appropriate weight, the products were summed, and the total was then divided by the number of possible responses within each category to yield the "effort score." The preliminary analyses of the collected data are shown in Table 1.

Summary of the Findings

"Considerable similarity was noted among the projects in the first year evaluation concerning their priorities and activities even though the sizes, settings and type of faculty were quite different among the various projects. These data for this evaluation reveal even greater similarity in spelling out an apparent life-cycle to Dean's Grant Projects, one that may be valuable for describing and comparing the work and accomplishments of projects both in groups and individually. The life cycle in brief is as follows. First year projects are most concerned with expanding faculty knowledge, next with faculty attitudes and then with skills in analysis and diagnosis. Student concerns are a low priority for first year projects, and curriculum change is only a slightly greater concern. Activities are focused most strongly upon retraining of faculty, looking forward to dissemination of information to their students through the accompanying course revision that is to take place.

"Second year projects maintain a strong concern for faculty knowledge and put with it activities that will increase skills and improve attitudes. The training is continued either with the same or with new faculty. Simultaneously, there is an almost equal concern with increasing the knowledge, attitudes and skills of students, presumably through the dissemination efforts of the newly trained faculty. Most concern seems to be in the area of course revision with a secondary concern by comparison with development of experiences and materials for the courses. Concommitant with this concern is activity generated as needed to revise and create suitable structures for the institutionalization of these changes.

"The three plus projects reflect at least minor concern in all of these areas, but seem to focus most strongly upon completing and refining the curriculum revisions that were begun in the second year. Third year projects are basically through with faculty training, except possibly as needed to keep up with current information; student knowledge is of moderate concern with student attitudes and skills a somewhat lesser concern. Activities overall reflect a tone of maintenance and completion. When compared with the high percentage of "not applicable" responses for third plus year projects, the percentages in the "completion" column take on more significance.

"In all, the life cycle reflected is an encouraging one in that it appears to reflect attention to tasks in logical sequence, satisfaction of goals, and consistency among a large majority of projects in terms of the concerns and activities undertaken. One area of concern is the relatively low "completion" ratings shown. More information from projects is needed to determine what this really means and to what it can be attributed (i.e., instrument factors)." (pp. 11-12)

Source: Central Regional Evaluation Committee. Regional Evaluation for Dean's Grant Projects: 1982 Report.

Table 1

CENTRAL REGION EVALUATION: PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSIS

Year 1: 5 projects Year 2: 6 projects Year 3: 5 projects (Total: 14)

Statement of Objective	Project Year	Ratings Completion Status of Activities: NA Raw Sc.	NA %	Not Started Raw Sc.	Not Started %	In Progress Raw Sc.	In Progress %	Completed Raw Sc.	Completed %	Effort Score	
Faculty Objective: Knowledge											
To expand faculty knowledge of concepts in P.L. 94-142, mainstreaming, least restrictive environment, handicapping conditions, remediation techniques, and methods and materials currently available in special education.	1	5/30	17%	1/30	3%	10/30	33%	14/30	47%	63/30 = 2.10	
	2	11/55	20%	2/55	4%	21/55	38%	21/55	38%	107/55 = 1.95	1.93
	3+	9/30	30%	1/30	3%	9/30	30%	11/30	37%	52/30 = 1.73	
Faculty Objective: Skills											
To provide faculty with the analytical, developmental and synthesis skills necessary to revise curriculum and provide students with the attitudes, knowledge, skills, and methods and materials necessary to function in special and mainstreamed classrooms and schools.	1	8/30	27%	10/30	33%	10/30	33%	2/30	7%	36/30 = 1.20	
	2	23/72	32%	7/72	9%	30/72	42%	12/72	17%	103/72 = 1.43	1.15
	3+	27/40	68%	0/40	0%	6/40	15%	7/40	17%	33/40 = .83	
Faculty Objective: Attitudes											
To create and enhance positive attitudes in faculty toward the handicapped and the special educators and teachers in mainstreamed classrooms.	1	8/30	27%	8/30	27%	7/30	23%	7/30	23%	43/30 = 1.43	
	2	12/53	23%	6/53	11%	19/53	36%	16/53	30%	92/53 = 1.74	1.33
	3+	27/40	67%	0/40	0%	6/40	15%	7/40	18%	33/40 = .83	

Table 1

CENTRAL REGION EVALUATION (Cont'd)

Year 1: 5 projects Year 2: 4 projects Year 3: 5 projects (Total 14)

Statement of Objective	Project Year	Ratings: Completion Status of Activities — NA Raw Sc.	NA %	Not Started Raw Sc.	Not Started %	In Progress Raw Sc.	In Progress %	Completed Raw Sc.	Completed %	Effort Score	
Student Objective: Knowledge											
To provide students in professional training programs (teacher education, special education, counseling, administration, secondary, elementary, early childhood education, etc.) with knowledge of P.L. 94-142, mainstreaming, handicapping conditions, remediation techniques, best practices and methods and materials currently available.	1	16/30	53%	9/30	30%	4/30	14%	1/30	3%	20/30 = .67	
	2	11/53	21%	2/53	4%	22/53	41%	18/53	34%	100/53 = 1.89	1.22
	3+	14/30	47%	3/30	10%	9/30	30%	4/30	13%	33/30 = 1.10	
Student Objective: Attitudes											
To create and enhance positive attitudes in students towards the handicapped, their families and teachers.	1	12/25	48%	10/25	40%	3/25	12%	0/25	0%	16/25 = .64	
	2	12/45	27%	0/45	0%	22/45	49%	11/45	24%	77/45 = 1.71	1.13
	3+	11/25	45%	1/25	5%	8/25	40%	3/25	10%	26/25 = 1.04	
Student Objective: Skills											
To provide students with a set of skills which will enable them to perform effectively in mainstreamed classrooms, diagnose handicapping conditions and prescribe or implement an appropriate intervention or treatment strategy.	1	18/30	60%	7/30	23%	5/30	17%	0/30	0%	17/30 = .57	
	2	18/54	33%	3/54	5%	19/54	35%	14/54	27%	83/54 = 1.54	1.05
	3+	12/28	43%	6/28	21%	7/28	25%	3/28	11%	29/28 = 1.04	

Table 1

CENTRAL REGION EVALUATION (Cont'd)

Year 1: 5 projects Year 2: 5 projects Year 3: 5 projects (Total 15)

Statement of Objective	Project Year	Ratings: Completion Status of Activities — NA Raw Sc.	NA %	Not Started Raw Sc.	Not Started %	In Progress Raw Sc.	In Progress %	Completed Raw Sc.	Completed %	Effort Score	
Curriculum Objective: Courses	1	1/15	7%	5/15	33%	7/15	47%	2/15	13%	25/15 = 1.67	
To accomplish changing the content in existing courses or adding new ones to provide an emphasis on exceptional children and mainstreaming where none existed previously.	2	4/27	15%	0/27	0%	18/27	67%	5/27	18%	51/27 = 1.89	1.83
	3+	3/14	21%	0/14	0%	6/14	43%	5/14	36%	27/14 = 1.93	
Curriculum Objective: Experiences	1	6/20	30%	6/20	30%	8/20	40%	0/20	0%	22/20 = 1.10	
To design and implement activities to introduce practice or apply knowledge about exceptional children and mainstreaming.	2	12/36	33%	2/36	6%	19/36	53%	3/36	8%	49/36 = 1.36	1.19
	3+	10/20	50%	0/20	0%	10/20	50%	2/20	1%	22/20 = 1.10	
Curriculum Objective: Materials	1	5/20	25%	9/20	45%	6/20	30%	0/20	0%	24/20 = 1.20	
To develop or acquire print, audio, visual materials and combinations thereof to deliver instruction about exceptional children and mainstreaming.	2	10/35	29%	2/35	6%	19/35	54%	4/35	11%	48/35 = 1.37	1.29
	3+	7/20	35%	0/20	0%	13/20	65%	0/20	0%	26/20 = 1.30	
Organizational Structure Objective:	1	12/30	40%	3/30	10%	11/30	37%	4/30	13%	37/30 = 1.23	
To create suitable structural, functional and procedural arrangements to institutionalize the content and intent of P.L. 94-142.	2	17/54	31%	4/54	7%	23/54	43%	10/54	19%	80/54 = 1.48	1.24
	3+	17/30	57%	1/30	3%	7/30	23%	5/30	17%	30/30 = 1.00	

National Evaluation of Dean's Grant Projects

Each project receiving funds in 1980-81 was asked to send to Teaching Research its most recent proposal for review. All proposals were read by two reviewers. The objectives of the proposals were categorized across six general areas by year of funding. These areas are

1. awareness and attitude change,
2. curriculum changes,
3. administrative changes,
4. product and material development,
5. student changes, and
6. success of graduates.

A questionnaire was developed and sent to a sample of 96 projects selected on the basis of such stratification variables as size of institution, geographic location, and year of funding. Information was requested only on the particular objective that was drawn for the sample, a procedure that permitted a larger number of projects to be represented in the total sample and did not single out any for complete evaluation. The directors of the 75 projects which formerly had been funded were asked to respond to all six areas of the questionnaire.

Frequency counts were tabulated by year of funding on the procedures used to achieve the common objectives. Table 1 shows the percentage of current projects having objectives in the area of emphasis.

The major conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. Establishing institutional policy statements that support changes in curriculum, is very important to the success of the project.
2. The largest single problem encountered by former projects was Regular Education faculty resistance to change.
3. Making curriculum changes and incorporating them into the degree program was the most successful and lasting part of the former projects.
4. The measurement of student change and graduate success has not been a priority with Deans Grant Projects.
5. First year projects seem to be off to a better and faster start when compared with earlier projects.
6. Awareness and attitude change was the major emphasis of the Deans Grant Projects.
7. The amount of assistance available through developed products is considerably more abundant now than it was for the early projects.
8. The average size of institutions receiving Deans Grant Projects has steadily reduced.
9. A set of guidelines need to be developed for new projects that clearly spells out expectations for:
   a. short term faculty awareness training
   b. curriculum changes

c. policy statements on degree requirements
d. institutional budget support
e. incorporation of "best practices" from other projects
f. measurement of student change
g. measurement of graduate success
h. documentation of successful processes
i. interagency cooperation

Table 1

% OF PROJECTS HAVING
OBJECTIVES IN AREA OF EMPHASIS*

Area of Emphasis	Year of Funding					
	1	2	3	4	5**	6
Awareness & Attitude	92	91	65	60	--	85
Curriculum Changes	69	81	65	60	--	71
Administrative Changes	17	19	18	60	--	28
Materials Development	15	25	29	40	--	21
Student Change	10	13	24	40	--	7
Graduate Success	-	-	-	-	--	29
Other	14	18	18	20	--	50
Sample Size	N=48	N=32	N=17	N= 5	N= 2	N=14

*There were four (4) projects for which we could not find a single objective.

**There were not enough projects identified as being in Year 5 to be included in the study.

Source: Teaching Research. Dean's Grant Projects Evaluation, Phase 1: Executive Summary, January 1982. (This report is not for general distribution.)

Project Demographies and Outcomes
111 Dean's Grants
A Survey of Projects Funded in 1979-80

As part of her doctoral dissertation research for American University, Marjorie W. Gazoda surveyed 111 of the 112 Dean's Grant Projects funded during 1979-80. The median project that year was in its second year of funding, employing a project coordinator who was an assistant professor of special education. The project was situated in an urban, public university with a student enrollment of between 10,000 and 20,000; more than 50 per cent of the projects were focusing on the "certification areas/target populations" of (in order of emphasis) elementary education, secondary education, and special education.

Project Outcomes

In summarizing the goals for and outcomes of their projects on several brief rating scales, respondents gave the highest average rank to "General awareness of P.L. 94-142," followed by "Attitudinal change of faculty," "Curricular revisions," "Attitudinal change of students," "Programmatic changes," and "Organizational changes." The rankings "undoubtedly" were related to the length of time the projects had been in operation, which is why general awareness and attitudinal topics probably were the most emphasized.

When respondents were given a list of 18 project outcomes and were asked to check those on which they had made "progress to the point of observed outcomes," the results shown in Table 2-9 were obtained.

Source: National Support Systems Project, The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: Author, University of Minnesota, October 1980, pp. 15-28.

Table 2-9

Project Levels Achieved to the Stage of Observed Outcomes

N = 109

	Frequency of Projects
Faculty Awareness/LRE	91
Developed Materials Resource Center	69
Advisory Committee Established	52
Developed Field-Based Experience	46
Established Continuing Project Staff	43
Team Teaching-Regular and Special Education	40
Redesigned Undergraduate Elementary Education	38
New Course-Special Education	34
Redesigned Undergraduate Secondary Education	34
New Course-Regular Education	33
Restructured Existing Course Sequence	30
Credit Course/Special Education	29
New Interdisciplinary Course	16
Restructured Department	16
New Course-Other	15
Independent Study Course	13
Team Teaching-Other	13
Restructured College	11
Other	25

The report of Gazvoda's work was one chapter of "A Descriptive Analysis and Evaluation" compiled by the National Support Systems Project. In the "Executive Report" preceding the various reports, the following summaries were presented under the heading , "What Goes On In DGPs?"

Procedures that seem to work well include the following:

- Use of DGP resources in small amounts to support many faculty activities rather than to support a small project staff.
- Strong leadership by the dean.
- Systematic involvement of all faculty members.
- Use of parents, handicapped persons, and "outside" educators as advisers.
- Use of highly reputable, "regular" faculty members as leaders.

Procedures that do not work well include the following:

- o "Ownership" of the project held in the special education department.
- o Just "adding on a course" from the special education department.

What are the reactions of students and community educators to DGPs?

- o Positive, even excited, about developments.
- o Much inquiry: "What's happening?"
- o Quality is demanded. "If it's just 'more of the same', forget it!"

What progress has been made?

A survey of all projects (111 of 112 projects responding) in Spring 1980 showed the following results for projects in years 4 and 5:

	Per cent having made significant or complete changes
Curriculum changes	72
Faculty knowledge re Public Law 94-142	87
Student knowledge re Public Law 94-142	88
Broad program changes accomplished	58
Practicums revised	42

After 3-4 years of operation, DGPs are demonstrating nearly a 90 per cent level of accomplishment in faculty and student "awareness and knowledge" and about 70 per cent in curriculum change. More than half the DGPs have made broad programmatic changes in response to Public Law 94-142. Less than half (42%) have accomplished goals in revising practicums, but that may be expected in view of the DGP emphasis on faculty awareness and curriculum change. Progress has been much better in some areas, notably, elementary education, than in others.

Facing the Future in Dean's Grant Projects

Maynard C. Reynolds

University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT: This paper is based on an oral presentation made at the last annual meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects called by the National Support Systems Project in Spring 1982 and is published in toto in the report of that conference. The discussion of the early concerns of the projects leads into the examination of some of the difficult challenges and problems facing teacher education in the future.

THE first national meeting of representatives of the Dean's Grant Projects was held in Bloomington, Minnesota, in July 1975, a few months before Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was signed into law by then-President Ford. The Dean's Grant program had been initiated in 1975 by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (U.S. Office of Education) and 59 projects had been funded for the year 1975-76. Representing the 59 projects in 1975 were 112 delegates to the national meeting: deans, special educators, and regular educators, all involved in teacher preparation. The host institutions were located in 31 states, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of American Samoa. In the Spring of 1982, 127 DGPs were funded in the program; they were located in 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. From 1974 to 1982, the institutions where Dean's Grant Projects were located trained more than 40 per cent of the new teachers entering the nation's schools.

Dr. Reynolds was Director of the National Support Systems Project during its existence (1975-1982). He is Professor of Special Education, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education.

This paper in a slightly expanded form was initially published in The Future of Mainstreaming: Next Steps in Teacher Education (M. C. Reynolds, Ed.), distributed by the Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, VA, 1982.

SP 023 256

It is fitting that the leadership of Edwin Martin, the Deputy Commissioner of Education and Director of BEH at the time the Dean's Grant program was started, be acknowledged for developing the program. As I recall, the idea was generated by Martin and a group of deans of education who had been linked to projects at the University of Nebraska and University of North Dakota. We owe to them and Thomas Behrens, the first project officer for DGPs, a considerable debt for recognizing and acting on the broad responsibilities of teacher-education institutions toward handicapped students and the nation's public schools.[1] I remember a talk by Martin during that period in which he discussed the "dichotomous relations between regular and special education"; he predicted that educators soon would have to renegotiate (a term which has since become a favorite of mine) those relations, that they would have to find ways to come back together again. He saw the Dean's Grant program as one avenue for the necessary renegotiation.

We were frankly uncertain in 1975 about whether DGPs would work. In a way we were like those early European explorers who set out for terra incognita: We weren't sure where we were going, if we would get there, what path to follow, and even, whether we had the right vehicle for the trip. About all we had in our favor was a strong general acceptance of the fact that the time had come to up-date the preparation of regular classroom teachers, taking into account the needs of handicapped students.

In planning that first national meeting in 1975, we knew that it would have to be broad in its appeal, that the presentations would have to make as much sense to regular educators as they did to special educators. The purpose of the meeting, after all, was not to "sell" special education but, rather, to open both kinds of education to a new concept of delivering educational services to children who were often neglected by the schools. We were fortunate in our choice of speakers.[2]

The first address at the 1975 meeting (after Martin's introductory remarks) was given by Tom Gilhool. He had been the attorney for the plaintiffs in the PARC case in 1971-72 from which there emerged distinctly, for the first time, the principles of the right to education, education that is appropriate to the individual, parental right to participate in educational planning for their children, the application of the least restrictive alternative in the placement of children, and due process. To me, the concept of least restrictive alternative was never made so clear as in the consent agreement which Gilhool negotiated with the Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania in 1971. I particularly remember Gilhool's observation that what started in the PARC case on behalf of retarded children was but an opener for individualizing educational programs for all children. He is, I

---

[1] I wish to express appreciation to George Hagerty who succeeded Tom Behrens as project officer for the DGPs and to Edward Sontag who heads Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, at the time of this writing. Both have contributed greatly to the Dean's Grant Projects in many ways.

[2] The major presenters (and discussants) were Edwin Martin; Thomas K. Gilhool (Geraldine J. Clifford, Dan C. Lortie, Jeanne B. Frein, Leslie Brinegar, and Robert Egbert); Richard E. Snow (Herbert Klausmeier, Charles Meisgeier, and Asa G. Hillard III); Rue Cromwell (Dean Corrigan, Richard A. Johnson, and Reginald L. Jones); Henry J. Bertness; and Michael Scriven.

believe, one of those particularly foresightful attorneys who recognized long before many of us the import of the principles embodied in PARC and, eventually, in Public Law 94-142.

Geraldine Clifford, an historian from the University of California at Berkeley, responded to Gilhool's paper by summarizing the ways schools in our nation have tried to accommodate pupil populations with special needs over two centuries. She stressed the fact that changes have never been linear; that is, they never have followed a straight line from recognition of the problem to general adoption of a solution. She gave many examples of the torturous path taken by schools in becoming more inclusive of children who did not fit the normal stereotype. Expectations for the implementation of what became Public Law 94-142, she thought, might well include setbacks and much complexity.

Prof. Klausmeier, of the University of Wisconsin, explained the IGE (Individually Guided Education) program, a broad educational delivery system devised to take account of children's individual differences. Prof. Richard Snow, of Stanford University, reported on the state of the art of individualizing instruction at that time. Working with Lee Cronbach, Snow had helped to restore meaning to the concept of aptitude as related to the adaptation of instruction to the individual, and he told us of these emerging ideas.

Examining the ethics and logic of mainstreaming, Prof. Michael Scriven raised the question of trade-offs: When one child is excluded from a regular classroom because of a handicap, are the possible catastrophic effects upon that child worth what may be only marginal gains for the rest of the class? Many educators are still wrestling with this question. To face it is to recognize the moral and ethical dimensions of child classification and placement issues.

Despite our uncertainties, we were right to take a rather broad approach to the Dean's Grant Projects rather than a sharply limited perspective. The concept of the least restrictive alternative, a major principle of Public Law 94-142, is so basic to the future of education that it calls for broad and important changes in teacher preparation. As you know, this principle mandates that every handicapped child be provided with instruction in a setting that is the closest to normal (i.e., regular classroom or part-time resource room instead of special setting; community residences instead of institutions) in which he or she can function successfully rather than to move the child to an isolated environment.

We have made much progress over the past seven years in the Dean's Grant Projects, especially in building awareness among teacher-education faculties of the rights and needs of special education. In addition, we have helped to chart the "journey" to be made in reconstructing curriculums for teacher preparation.

DIFFICULTIES WE FACE IN THE FUTURE

ALL is not smooth sailing, however. New uncertainties have appeared in many colleges and universities, including fiscal retrenchment and personnel cutbacks. Teacher-education units have been affected more deeply than other units in many institutions and the despair felt by some faculty members has itself become a source of great concern.

The "new federalism," which proposes the devolution of the federal role in many categorical education programs back to state and local agencies, also raises complications, especially when accompanied by budgetary recisions. The Department of Education

budget for the Dean's Grant program was cut substantially for 1982-83.[3] Many other programs were reduced in similar amounts. Perhaps there will be a reversal of that negative trend, but it is hard to be optimistic about it, at least in the short range. What will happen if leadership in school affairs becomes increasingly a state and local matter and less a concern for the federal government? The schools have been quite responsive to the messages from the Congress and federal administration on the intent of Public Law 94-142, but if the federal government exhibits a declining interest in this area, whose voice will rise and be heard by the local leadership? Geraldine Clifford was surely correct in anticipating less than a linear record of progress in bringing handicapped children into the mainstream.

Another difficulty, one of rising concern, at least since the mid-1960s, is the general aura of distrust which has surrounded the public schools and the institutions providing teacher education. There is some anxiety over the numbers of private schools; they are growing at alarming rates in some parts of the nation and may overtake the public schools generally. If the advocates of voucher systems or tax breaks for parents who pay private school tuition have their way and the middle class deserts the public schools, then the public schools very well may be left mainly with the mission of serving those children who are not acceptable to the private schools.

The loss of public confidence in education is reflected specifically and strongly in the doubts expressed about teachers and teacher education. At least 18 states recently launched special testing programs to limit candidates for teaching; such moves have been described as simply "the opening gun in a broader effort to reform teacher education institutions and programs" (Vlaandeven, 1982, p. 20). Gene Lyons (1980), in an award-winning article, described teacher education as "a massive fraud. It drives out dedicated people, rewards incompetence, and wastes millions of dollars" (p. 108). Such expressions, coming at a time of severe financial cutbacks in education, can be cause for despair or special challenge. Those of us who are involved in the Dean's Grant Projects perhaps have more reason than most to accept the criticism as a challenge.

John Brandl, a professor at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, has noted that institutional retrenchment can occur only to a limited extent; then you reach a kind of threshold point at which the organization cannot tolerate any more simple retrenchment so you have to start restructuring it. We may have reached that point in many of our colleges and universities and especially in our teacher-training programs. The soft spots have been eliminated and we are down to the bare bones where, if any additional changes are made in resources and funding, we shall have to rearrange the way those bones are put together.

Critical Problems and Issues

IN the remainder of this paper I discuss several topics that appear to me to be of critical importance for the future attempts to implement Public Law 94-142. My focus is mainly on teacher preparation, but problems and changes in the elementary and sec-

---

[3]The first cut was 48.5% from each grant; in late September 1982, after a supplemental appropriation by the Congress, about two-thirds of the cut was restored.

ondary schools also are considered, to the extent that they portend important changes in teacher preparation. The 1982 Dean's Grant Conference, which was introduced by these remarks, included a number of presentations that extended the particular topics touched upon in the following subsections (see Reynolds, 1982b).

The DGPs Should Deal with "Fundamentals"

Whenever major changes are called for in social programs and institutions the danger arises that the response will be expedient make-dos rather than fundamental changes. The schools of the nation have been rife with after-school workshops instructing teachers how to comply with Public Law 94-142, as if the problem were simply to fill out forms, to get parents' signatures, to satisfy the minimum procedural standards demanded by government monitors, and to "stay out of jail." But this kind of mechanical compliance, which is designed to meet the bare letter of the law, is not enough.

College and university personnel have a particular obligation to recognize that settling for the expedients, avoiding fundamental issues, and failing to identify new directions in public policy are wasteful and say a great deal about us. Those of us who staff the colleges are one step removed from the legal imperatives facing the personnel of elementary and secondary schools and, therefore, we may be in a better position to identify the challenges presented by Public Law 94-142. The policies expressed in the law seek the reexamination of the purposes of education, the relations of schools and families, and values and technical aspects of schooling. Our training efforts ought to be directed to these deeper strata of role and organizational changes required by the new policies.

One way of acknowledging the changes required by Public Law 94-142 is to identify and explicate the implications of the law for the foundations area of teacher preparation. Such a move would relate the significance of the law to the courses in sociology, philosophy, measurements, and similar topics which are covered by the phrase, "foundations of education." The NSSP conducted a conference in Denver at the end of March (1982) to discuss the role of foundations of education faculties in up-dating the preparation of teachers (Peynolds, 1982a).

It is my experience that foundations faculty members are unaccustomed to talking to their colleagues in curriculum and instruction but, also, and perhaps more important, they frequently fail to communicate regularly with each other. For example, measurements specialists often conduct their courses with too little consideration for the social implications of what they are doing. Courses taught in isolation tend not to be effective. Perhaps all of us need to be reminded, too, that the best teacher-education programs probably are those in which the faculty members have fully aired their ideas and come to some agreement about what schools should achieve and how teachers should perform to insure those achievements.

We were not wrong at that first national meeting of DGP representatives or in the more recent meeting on foundations of teacher preparation to take a broad perspective on the work of DGPs. Many people regard Public Law 94-142 as one of the most important policy statements on education ever made. In fact, what we are into in the Dean's Grant Projects is the revision of public education, changing the concept of what it is, who it is for, and how it should be provided. It has taken some of us a while to realize that the revisions underway are revolutionary.

The Classification of Children

One problem that is specific to observing the least restrictive environment principle is the classification of children. As you know, present systems of funding special education require children to be classified as "mentally retarded," "learning disabled," "speech impaired," "seriously emotionally disturbed," or in some comparable category to be eligible for services. The labeling that results is deeply resented and resisted by many people. Currently we are on the threshold of major changes in identifying children with special needs.

At a recent DGP meeting, Robert Audette, a former State Director of Special Education in Massachusetts, reported on a letter which he had received from the U.S. Office of Civil Rights (OCR). The import of the letter was that Massachusetts schools must follow tradition in classifying children for special services under federal laws otherwise how could OCR tell whether the children were misclassified? This letter was a federal response to Chapter 766, the Massachusetts special education law covering the education of handicapped children; the law tries to minimize the need to categorize and label children before providing them with special services.

Audette also told about his work as a court-appointed expert in Mississippi. He and one other "expert" were called upon to help monitor the schools' compliance with a court order relating to the classification of students. Audette reported that an extraordinarily high percentage of the time (up to 95% in some districts) of specialists in the education of handicapped children was spent just on classification or entitlement decisions; as a result, these highly trained personnel were not available to help on the essential problems of instruction.

My colleague, Jim Ysseldyke, and his associates in the Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities at the University of Minnesota, have compared children in learning disabilities (LD) programs with other low-achieving pupils in the same schools who were not placed in special programs; they found that the children assigned to LD programs tended to have behavior problems. The conclusion, of course, is that special placements are not made strictly on the basis of technical discrepancies between intelligence and achievement which we suppose distinguish LD children; children assigned to special LD placements tend to be those who present behavior problems, and, thus, are inconvenient to teach in regular classes.

Tucker (1980) reported a shift in the rates at which children were classified as LD in the state of Texas after educators were embarrassed by the racial overtones reflected in the overrepresentation of black children in the EMR category. In New Jersey, data for 1981 show that a black child is four times more likely to be classified as EMR than a white child in that state.[4] And in Champaign, Illinois, the superintendent of schools reported a feeling of shock when he found that his school district was twenty-fourth on a list of the 100 most racially segregated special education programs in the nation (Mahan, First, & Coulter, 1980).

At the Wingspread Conference on public policy and the future of education, held in September 1981 (Reynolds & Brandl, in press), Gene Glass of the University of Colorado likened the

---

[4]Oral report of a New Jersey State Department of Education official at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference in April 1982.

present classification practices of special education for mildly and moderately handicapped children to the situation of schizophrenia in the mental health field some 20 years ago. He told about a conversation between two psychiatrists in which one said that he had heard of a new cure for schizophrenia. And the other said, "Well, that's interesting because in the same hospital I know two psychiatrists one of whom classifies schizophrenia at a 10% rate and the other at 90% in reference to the same hospital population." If we do not have reliability in the classification of children with learning problems and if the classifications are not treatment related, then we certainly need to make changes in how we go about making these decisions.

The problem is broader than just special education, of course. A variety of other narrowly framed programs, for example, for disadvantaged and low-English proficiency children, each with its special classification or entitlement procedures exists in many schools. Each program makes time-consuming procedural demands on specialists who must spend much time just on entitlement decisions, which keeps them from using their skills more productively in the instructional program.

Each categorical program also consumes the time of regular teachers who are expected to participate in referral and entitlement procedures. For example, all of us know about schools in which Title I teachers visit regular classroom teachers to negotiate the entitlement system for disadvantaged children, then the LD teachers come in with another, the ED with another, the EMH with still another, and the bilingual with still another--and then we wonder why a backlash against special programs occurs among regular teachers!

The classification problem affects even our national professional organizations. Consider, for example, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC); it seeks to provide a broad organizational structure for special teachers and other personnel who work with handicapped children in the schools. The Council has about 55,000 members of whom about 9,000 belong to a Division on Learning Disabilities. During the Summer of 1982 that division conducted a mail ballot on whether to disaffiliate from CEC. If the Learning Disability group pulls out with its thousands of members, it may destroy CEC at the very moment that the renegotiation of relations among different categories or professional streams must be accelerated. It is rare that one sees anything more self-destructive than this kind of enclave mentality.

We cannot justify the fragmentation of efforts and resources into so many different programs to serve children with various special needs; often these needs can be met by the same teachers. There is no separate knowledge base for teaching reading to Title I as contrasted with LD children; so why do we go on with these complicated, expensive, isolated, separate programs for children and pretend that the teachers need to be separately prepared? We owe to regular classroom teachers a more unified support structure that makes their situation more manageable; we owe to children the efficient provision of the instruction they need without going through time consuming, wasteful, and hurtful processes of labeling; and we owe to the public the financial savings that could be generated by cutting out needless classification processes.

It is past the time to take a penetrating look at some of the categories we have been using to slot children for administrative and teacher-training purposes. Note, if you will, that many of us conduct our teacher training in the same narrow, unreliable, inefficient categories as are used to classify children. This is one of the major areas for challenge and change

in the near future.

Changing Social Structures

Another area in which change is imminent, I think, is in the ways the schools manage student social structures. The general movement toward greater inclusiveness in the schools has resulted, obviously, in a greater diversity of children in classrooms. William Copeland of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, one of the initiators of the Wingspread Conference, made some trenchant observations on the functioning of schools in his epilogue to the conference report:

> As the schools are not staffed, organized, and financed, they can only teach well if they exclude; conversely, if they do not exclude, they cannot teach well. Put another way, under present conditions, schools can meet their substantive educational requirements only if they violate constitutional requirements; or, they can meet their constitutional requirements only if they violate those substantive educational requirements....
>
> Thus we are left with the following kinds of general options for the 1980s:
>
> 1. Back down on the constitutional mandates (or their procedural implementation), or
>
> 2. back down on the teaching goals, or
>
> 3. change the staffing (and preparatory education), organization (not only of schools internally but, also, of the governance of the educational system), or financing (in amount as well as structure) of public schools, or all three.
>
> The general thinking of the conference participants was that if we do not pay close attention to the third option, we shall have to suffer one or both of the first two. (Copeland, in press).

Roger and David Johnson have been frequent contributors to DGP activities, showing how the classrooms of regular schools can be reorganized to make the diversity of pupils a "plus" rather than a problem. In research and practice they have shown how children can be taught to be helpful to one another - to be cooperative - with gains for everyone concerned.[5] The schools will succeed in being totally inclusive only if we make some of the kinds of changes in social structures which the Johnsons and their colleagues have helped us to envision. The implications of these new insights are profound, both for school operations and for teacher education. Rarely has the content emerging from this line of research been included in teacher preparation, yet it is important that the environment of classrooms be improved.

---

[5] See Roger Johnson and David Johnson, Promoting constructive student-student relationships through cooperative learning (1980), a resource unit distributed by AACTE.

Changes in Measurement and Assessment

Another area that is being restructured is measurement systems. Currently, we are required to set explicit goals for individual handicapped pupils and to measure their progress in the context of instruction. To perform the measurement function competently requires quite a different (or added) kind of preparation than most teachers now receive. Emphasis must be shifted mainly to curriculum-based (domain-referenced) assessment. The way we go about measurements in the schools may be one of our fundamental operations. Such procedures relate to the design, evaluation, and motivation of the whole educational enterprise. I recommend a careful reading of the proceedings of the Foundations of Education Conference on this subject (Reynolds, 1982a).

The "Related Services" Problem

Under Public Law 94-142 the schools are required to provide special education "and related services"; the latter is an interesting even if ambiguous phrase. Judicial interpretations have tended to broaden rather than narrow the concept of "related services." Thus we have situations, for example, in which health-related professions, such as PT and OT, are moving into the schools to provide "related services" as independent practitioners.

Schools are responsible for studying children carefully; for many children, this means reviews of their health as well as academic status. It is not clear how schools should make the decisions to call in health resources or who should pay for them.

In colleges and universities, our students in teacher education usually have little opportunity to interact with students in medicine, PT, OT, music therapy, speech-language therapy, psychology, and so on. Consequently, when they go into employment in the elementary or secondary schools they meet their colleagues in these professions as strangers. They have n common language for communication and little appreciation of what each can contribute to enhancing the education of handicapped children.

A few Dean's Grant Projects are beginning to look at the possibilities of cutting across the fields of education and health and social services. They are organizing shared training experiences for the several professions. We need the insights of people conducting these projects as we work toward the solution of the "related services" issue and the general problem of coordinating services for handicapped students and their families. In particular we will find it helpful, I am sure, to turn to Carolyn Del Polito and other staff members of the Allied Health Professions and learn about efforts to alert all the human services professions to the implications of Public Law 94-142.

The Need for Courageous Leadership

At the 1975 national DGP meeting, Geraldine Clifford suggested that the spate of law suits during the preceding decade may have been generated by the absence of leadership in education. Jeanne B. Frein, another reactor to Gilhool's address, also touched on the subject when she asked, "...how many educational decisions, or decisions that should be educational, are going to be made by judges/lawyers?" The question to which all educators must attend at the moment is whether future changes in education will continue to be reactions to judicial decisions and/or legislative enactments or whether they will be generated by the practicing members of the profession. The answers to this question will

determine the kinds of schools in which children are educated in the future. Let me project some possibilities:

Projection 1. Heroic efforts are made in the face of great difficulties to hold together the public schools and present forms of teacher education. Nothing revolutionary is attempted; the emphasis is on accommodating the hard realities of the present situation. Somthing like 1200 extant colleges and universities continue to prepare teachers. Some institutions do a better job than others and they are honored modestly for their good work, but the changes made in most programs are limited. Inroads continue to be made by legislators and other "outsiders" in the monitoring of quality in teacher education because few people have confidence in teacher educators' ability to manage their own house. This picture reflects the present unsatisfactory scene, one that could lead to the second projection.

Projection 2. The public schools simply fail. Despite their attempts they cannot provide quality education, and they collapse as central community institutions. The middle class deserts the public schools and only little enclaves of "special" children, each with a different diagnostic classification, are left in the large buildings. (Recently, an administrator of the State Department of Education in New Jersey reported that 52% of the children in the public schools of that state are now enrolled in one or more categorical programs, at least for part of each school day. These are the children who will be left in the public schools when and if the middle class takes off to swell the rolls of the private schools.) A corollary of this disastrous public school situation is that teacher-education programs, as we now know them, also fall into total disrepute and the schools (both private and public) begin to employ substantial numbers of personnel who have little or no professional preparation.

Projection 3. A more hopeful view! Small sets of teacher-education programs link voluntarily to do something of truly high quality. For example, eight or 10 deans of education and the institutions they serve join to work aggressively for "state of the art" levels of teacher preparation. In this they are joined by a few strong public policy leaders who sense the significance of professional teacher preparation and are willing to help educators to seek improvement. They have examined the knowledge bases for teacher preparation and are willing to say what they think good teacher preparation is. Each group coordinates its activities so that some educators work on curriculum, others show up when decisions effecting teacher education are to be made by the Congress, or appear as experts when NCATE standards are under review or difficult suits about the quality of schooling are being heard. They publish their best ideas and aspirations and set a hard pace and standards for the improvement of teacher education. They support general organizations of teacher educators yet move ahead of such groups by magnifying the most progressive and promising aspects of teacher education. The Dean's Grant Projects, at least a selected few, could become this special kind of progressive force in teacher education. Subsets of DGPs also might serve as strong regional advocates for quality in teacher preparation.

The purpose of these projections is to emphasize our need for models of strength and quality in teacher education. The first two hold no promise for the future. We need people and institutions to spell out the "state of the art" and to reach for that level of operation in teacher education. Perhaps something like the third projection is realistic, indeed a necessity.

An argument encountered all too often in teacher education

is what might be called the "know-nothing" view. It consists of pointing out how many different points of view there are on most issues in teacher education; it is an easy step from there to say that we "know nothing" for sure. Thus each institution spells out its own plans which are examined for quality only in procedural terms (e.g., numbers of books in the library, processes by which teacher education plans are made, etc.) in meeting their own goals. I consider such an attitude toward teacher education wrong and a major source of the great difficulties in public confidence which we now face. It is exactly the opposite of the view taken by the Bicentennial Report of the AACTE and by leaders such as B. O. Smith. Courageous leadership is needed to take the quality course: one that spells out the "state of the art" and begins to work for accountability at that level.

Temporary Support Systems

I was privileged to work with the Dean's Grant Projects for seven years. During that time my colleagues and I operated NSSP as a temporary support system for the projects. As part of our work, we provided DGPs with the help of their peers, opened avenues of communication among DGPs and between DGPs and "outside" organizations, and supported creative people in projects to help them to develop ideas and products which could be shared. Through the regional liaison system, most projects were visited by advocacy-oriented colleagues and some technical assistance was provided to projects when it was needed. There is more to the story, but it need not be detailed here.

I am a strong believer in temporary support systems as a means of adding impetus to and building upon the creativity of people in special projects (see Reynolds, 1975; the publication is a report of a conference on support systems held in Washington, D.C., May 1974). Temporary systems are not encumbered by the bureaucratic machinery of entrenched structures in which the life of the organization sometimes seems to take precedence over its purposes. Making decisions is relatively easy in the temporary systems; in larger standing structures members may agree on an important line of work, but they may not be able to do anything because "the committee does not meet until six months from now or next year." Often we do not have six months to resolve problems. Simple problems may become critical if one waits for consensus or for decisions at annual meetings!

The very nature of temporary support systems makes them more flexible and more immediate. They have the adaptability to solve small problems quickly and to prevent them from becoming large and threatening the life of the organization. Temporary support systems do not become inbred. They can seek out and use ideas generated in many places by many different people. In addition, they can work closely and constructively with permanent organizations in the field without competing with them. To my way of thinking, when a temporary support system goes out of business, the permanent structures in the field should be the stronger for having had the contributions of the temporary system.

Persons associated with temporary structures need to be absolutely clear with themselves that they are indeed temporary, that they are not going to go on forever. They must be ready to bow out at any time.

I believe that the NSSP was useful as a temporary support system for the Dean's Grant Projects. Our work ended with the fiscal year (June 1982), except for a brief extension to complete certain publications and reports. I strongly believe it was necessary to bring project personnel together in various ways

during the formative first seven years. There may be some new form of support for the DGPs but winning support for temporary support systems in the future may be more difficult. I believe we should not give up the idea, however, and I am encouraged by what I hear on this subject. Perhaps support systems will be kept alive mainly through voluntary efforts, but some provision for national leadership is important, I believe. In any case, how the Dean's Grant Projects can continue some kind of network for mutual help and support is a question that should be considered by the projects as well as by Department of Education staff at this time.

Conclusion

I have tried to discuss some of the difficult challenges and problems which teacher education personnel face in the future. I have tried to be realistic and, yet, optimistic and, in particular, to express the belief that those of us associated with the Dean's Grant Projects have a special opportunity to provide the leadership to meet the difficult challenges of the future. Hopefully the work of the Dean's Grant Projects will be useful to the broader set of teacher-preparation centers as the difficult tasks of the 1980s unfold.

References

Copeland, W. C. Strategies for special education in the 1980s: A conference epilogue. In M. C. Reynolds & J. Brandl (Eds.), Public policy and the special education task for the 1980s: Report of the Wingspread Conference. Policy Studies Review, Special Issue (in press).

Lyons, G. Why teachers can't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, October 1980, 62(2), 108-112.

Mahan, H. J., First, J. M., & Coulter, W. A. An end to double jeopardy: Declassification/transition of minority EMH students in Champaign, Illinois. Champaign, IL: Office of Transition and Programs for the Mildly Handicapped, 1980.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). National technical assistance systems in special education. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1975.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Foundations of teacher preparation: Responses to Public Law 94-142. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982. (One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036)

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). The future of mainstreaming: Next steps in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036), 1982. (b)

Reynolds, M. C., & Brandl, J. (Eds.). Public policy and the special education task for the 1980s: Report of the Wingspread Conference. Policy Studies Review, Special Issue (in press).

Tucker, J. A. Ethnic proportions in classes for the learning disabled. Journal of Special Education, 1980, 14(1), 93-105.

Vlaandeven, R. B. Teacher competency testing: Status report. Educational Measurement, 1982, 1(2), 17-20 & 27.

The Development of Materials and Resources for Dean's Grant Projects

Karen M. Lundholm

University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT: The products relating to the work of the Dean's Grant Projects can be found in at least four places: (a) the literature developed by NSSP; (b) the curriculum framework suggested by NSSP and DGPs and the supporting documentation offered to teacher educators; (c) the products of the individual projects; and (d) the creativity of the personnel responsible for advancing the collective programs. The products of the DGPs are highly useful by themselves, but when they are viewed in the context of the curriculum development proposals of the NSSP/DGPs they provide a systematic illustration of project emphases. In turn, the curriculum framework and supporting documentation are themselves strengthened by the literature, practices, and issues presented and discussed throughout the NSSP-developed literature.

What emerges from these resources is a four-pronged attack on the issues that arise when efforts are made to expand the preparation of regular and, indeed, all educators for new roles to accommodate the educational needs of handicapped (and nonhandicapped) children in least restrictive settings. The Dean's Grant program is one of the most energized and challenging initiatives in teacher education today and it has provided a useful body of literature for educators. A list of LTI/NSSP publications is attached.

THE purpose of this chapter is not to account for all the individual products developed by Dean's Grant Projects but, rather, to characterize the nature of the materials developed and to delineate conditions under which these resources were pro-

---

Ms. Lundholm has been the Assistant to the Director since the inception of NSSP.

SP 023 257

duced and used. The discussion is organized according to the following outline:

- o The developmental pattern across the projects.
- o The work of the National Support Systems Project in materials development for both planning and support purposes.
- o Materials development across the network of DGPs.
- o Dissemination channels for current materials.
- o Personnel resources.

Conditions Governing the Development and Use of Materials and Resources in Dean's Grant Projects

THROUGHOUT the first seven years of the DGPs, documented results and tangible products were expected and anticipated: What and where are the products of the projects? In seeking answers, it is useful to recognize the following characteristics:

o The primary purpose of DGPs never was intended to be the development and dissemination of materials. Indeed, the production of materials, whether instructional or informational, was incidental to the primary purposes of awareness, faculty development, curriculum revision, and related documentation.

o The instructional and informational materials that were developed were created to meet distinctly local needs; they reflect the particular situation of a particular setting at a particular moment. Expectations for a set or sets of slick, tested, "cook-book style" materials to conduct a Dean's Grant Project were premature, if not unrealistic. Planning options, faculty development strategies, guides to curriculum revisions, extended curriculum outlines, evaluation and measurement formats, timelines, and procedural recommendations contained as many variations as there are numbers of DGPs.

o Project personnel who devised materials did not expect them to be used for long periods of time, or even to be applied to other settings. Materials often were offered to other teacher-education institutions with open permission to revise or adapt, providing credit was given to the initial developers. The educators who work toward the achievement of grant objectives are imbued with solid respect for the urgencies and complexities of their shared task; they are practical about the time, resources, and energies required to develop suitable materials just for immediate local use, let alone for publication.

o In most projects, the developers of materials tend to be junior in faculty status and to be professional educators rather than professional developers; occasionally, educators and technicians have joined forces to produce and package products for broader distribution, but such instances have been the exception.

o After all is said and done (or after much is said and all is done), the accommodation of mildly handicapped children in regular school programs requires essentially the practice of sound, known teaching methods. The materials, with few exceptions, are those same basic resources found useful in strong teacher-education programs. It probably is true that instructional panaceas have not been discovered by the DGPs, but that the needs for updated teacher-education programs are being rediscovered and validated. The adjustments that have been advanced among DGPs are primarily in increased professional awareness and sensitivity to the needs of all children, administrative leadership and resource

allocation, and application of the state of the art in classrooms. Results documented by DGPs show actual, if modest, rearrangements of teacher-education structures and practices to incorporate the new social and legal mandates articulated in Public Law 94-142, other federal statutes, and state legislation. In the last analysis, it may be that the major contribution of the DGPs has not been the generation of new content but, rather, the introduction and legitimation of formal change processes into teacher-education staff-development programs, realignments of professional personnel, and concomitant developments in curriculum offerings and program updating.

The nature of the Dean's Grant program has been one of fostering cooperation and sharing among individual projects and project personnel. The notion of professional sharing does not receive much attention these days in publications or formal academic reward structures. But DGPs, like travelers in terra incognita, have been dependent on each other for survival as well as progress. A unique contribution of the program, perhaps, has been the development among projects of candid communication on procedurally and politically sensitive topics that cut across the work of each.

Much has been written about professional protectiveness surrounding academic initatives, certainly in matters of research and development; the reasons are well documented. Although this protectiveness may not prevail to the same degree in the teacher-education community, members of the DGP community showed initial reluctance to enter fully into open explorations and problem-solving discussions. The history of the development of the climate of communications in which DGPs function is interesting but not relevant here with perhaps this exception: At first, DGP personnel were reserved and hesitant about indicating anything less than mastery of their purposes; with time, these same personnel increasingly acknowledged the unknown qualities of the territory in which they were working and that no one project had a better grasp of the problems and solutions than any other, that their missions virtually were untried in higher education, and that survival required the pooling of information and a sharing of procedures, strategies, and results.

The shared sense of community was developed through a number of regional and national meetings of project personnel, the strong support of federal officers, and the leadership of the NSSP director and regional liaisons in providing consistent, sustained examples of the best practices in professional and community cooperation. The response by the projects to the creation and maintenance of a climate that encouraged projects to search for and test out fledgling ideas initially was reservation and skepticism; gradually, participation and acceptance grew and flourished so that today the resources of the DGP community are beginning to be fully marshaled. The point here is that this sense of shared community and the permissibility of sharing less-than-perfected ideas has had significant impact on the work of the DGPs. It has been a significant factor in the development and use of resources (material and personnel) in creating the fundamental attitude that it is acceptable and even admirable to build openly and collaboratively on one another's ideas and experiences.

The preceding factors have been markedly instrumental in contributing to the development and use of materials among the Dean's Grant Projects.

Almost parenthetically it should be noted again that few DGPs are in the primary business of materials development. In general, one organizing principle of DGPs is that funds should not be used to support junior faculty members and other personnel

who, working apart from the main tasks of departments, attend mainly to the development of curriculum modules and other such materials. From the earliest days of DGPs, the measure of project effectiveness has been influence on curricular offerings and faculty members' awareness of new demands, not the development of materials. However, three projects in the early days were directed to materials production: one each at the University of Northern Colorado, The University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. The contributions of these three projects are substantial and continue to have import for the work of grant and non-grant institutions.

University of Northern Colorado

UNC was funded in 1974 to conduct an inservice training project to prepare regular educators to accommodate the educational needs of handicapped children. Under the leadership of Clifford Baker and Barbara Fowler, UNC conducted a survey of all special education departments in the nation to discover the most useful instructional materials, films, books, articles, and the like then in use that would give regular classroom teachers the skills and knowledge to meet the needs of mildly handicapped children in classrooms. The two investigators organized the responses into a set of resources for college-level faculty members. The first compilation was directed to the preparation of elementary teachers; Fowler then repeated the process for secondary-level teachers. In each instance, the materials were organized into approximately 25 units.

Instructional learning activities, complete with readings, references, games, and the like, were collected for each unit and organized into large notebooks. These materials contained more resources and references than any one program or instructor possibly could employ. The reference book was used "one on one" by a college faculty consultant who sat down with the faculty members teaching relevant courses and encouraged them to consider possible course adjustments. This comprehensive identification and listing of available materials then in practice in special education departments, and the application of these materials to actual course offerings, proved workable in Colorado. The resource collection also became a valuable foundation in similar efforts by some DGPs.

The resource materials were in demand outside the state of Colorado as soon as they were completed. UNC staff members applied for funds to duplicate and distribute the materials nationally or even regionally, but the request was denied. Nevertheless, UNC supplied copies to teacher-education programs within Colorado to the limit of its dissemination budget, and copies were sold on an at-cost basis for as long as the project could manage. A set of the materials was sent to NSSP and permission was given for sufficient copies to be reproduced for distribution to the then-current DGPs. Since those years, NSSP has distributed about 225 sets. Baker and Fowler have continued to make the materials available through an independent, at-cost reproduction service even though they have gone on to other responsibilities and vocations.

University of Texas at Austin

In 1975-1978 the DGP at the University of Texas at Austin, under direction of the coordinator, Dr. Donna Denney Haughton, developed a set of instructional modules around 10 primary objectives for the training of regular classroom teachers to work with handicapped children. The 10 modules followed a set format: statement of objectives; pretest; narrative with supporting activities and resources and activities were drawn, in large part, from the

work of Baker and Fowler but were extended and updated. The set of modules, illustrative activities, and some supporting video tapes were called "PREM" (Preparing Regular Educators for Mainstreaming). They were designed for use by teacher educators but were found to be applicable to both inservice and pre-service settings across the country.

The DGP at the University of Texas at Austin was not re-funded but, because of the many demands for PREM modules from institutions all over the country, the materials were given to NSSP for at-cost reproduction and distribution. NSSP has seen the materials through several reprints and has distributed them to audiences other than DGPs to a total of over 300 sets. The materials today are somewhat outdated but remain useful.

The University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee

Under the direction of Coordinator Susan Gruber, the DGP at UMW was funded to develop a comprehensive set of video tapes and supporting readings that addressed key issues in the implementation of Public Law 94-142 at both elementary and secondary levels. The materials were unusually well researched and of high quality. Under the title, "I'm a Lot Like You," the products addressed the understanding, assessment, and programing children with differences at elementary and secondary levels.

These comprehensive films and materials have been used by several states for the inservice and pre-service training of regular educators. Because of their scope, cost and reproduction have been complex issues. They were addressed satisfactorily for some time by at-cost duplication and distribution through the University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee Department of Exceptional Children. Because the requests were so numerous, UMW opted to place the materials with the LINC system where they were approved for commercial publication. There has been a period of considerable revision of the initial materials; during production time, approximately two years, the materials have not been available.

Dissemination

In each instance, chief authorship and leadership were provided by junior faculty members carrying the title of "project coordinator." Also, in each instance, the development of the materials did not particularly intersect with the curricular revision attempted at the host institution. The materials were in demand outside the project as rapidly as they were completed, and the developers aggressively sought to share them on a practical, useful, low-cost basis (the developers received no returns). In each instance, a good repository for the materials was not in existence, and no dissemination system was in place to make useful materials available. The dissemination issue here may not be particularly relevant; however, it is possible that DGP personnel have refrained from the wholesale development of materials partly for just that reason: Once materials are developed, no adequate system currently is in place for their adequate and effective dissemination.

UNC, University of Texas at Austin, and UMW made strong contributions to the development of materials/resources and each was in position and willing to make even stronger contributions had appropriate dissemination mechanisms been in place. The description of the products of these projects does not diminish the substantial development of curriculum materials undertaken subsequently by the University of Kansas, University of Michigan, Virginia Commonwealth University, Augustana College, and Oklahoma Baptist, among others. The observations are offered here to emphasize the absence of designated "centers" for the develop-

ment and testing of instructional materials among DGPs, and the fact that very few projects have used resources primarily to support materials development of a comprehensive nature.

Development Pattern Across Grants

THE roughly 250 Dean's Grant Projects funded over the past seven years present an impressive range of characteristics relating to geography, size of host institution, grant objectives and operational strategies, variety of leadership styles and staff-management patterns, areas of primary focus, degrees of curriculum change and successful institutionalization thereof, and many others. Despite these differences, there has been an observable and, in some instances, documented pattern of collective and individual project evolution. Each stage is accompanied by a scramble for relevant resources (material and personnel). The breakdown of this pattern helps to clarify the issues confronting each DGP and to illuminate further the nature of the materials search among the projects. It is of interest that almost all projects have evolved somewhat similarly; the projects of 1982-83 are not noticeably different from those of earlier days. The difference that does exist is that the turn-around time at each stage has been shortened, but the need to pass through that particular stage continues. The change process seems to require a fixed series of steps that must be addressed before the group is able or ready to move ahead.

The activities of DGPs fall into three broad areas: Awareness, Faculty Development, and Curriculum Change. The areas can be elaborated as follows:

Awareness I	(orientation to the issues)
Awareness II	(sensitivity to dimensions of the challenge and to change processes)
Diversion	(reconsideration of commitment)
Faculty Development	
Curriculum Change	
Outreach	
Evaluation and Dissemination	

In turn, each area can be further broken down into the following stages (the subsets address related interests in materials and resources):

Developmental Overview: DGPs

I. AWARENESS I (Orientation to the Issues):

Orientation of teacher-education community to issues surrounding Public Law 94-142 and the education of handicapped children (setting the context for the massive changes underway).

Familiarization of DGPs with provisions of Public Law 94-142 and state laws.

Estimates of how the laws and social mandates apply to institutions of higher education and to teacher-education programs. How much must be done?

Increasing awareness that DGPs need to address individual faculty members, individual courses, and the very substance and foundations of teacher-education programs.

(This stage, generally during Year 1 of the project, constitutes a general examination of the problem and an assessment of the dimensions of implications for the host institution. The commitment in place is largely a commitment to consider the problem and possible solutions.)

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Search for mainstreaming materials, bibliographies, resource lists.
- Search for personnel who can address contextual issues.
- Search for "keynote" speakers: credible, articulate educators of stature who can address faculty, administrative, and community populations on the work of the DGPs.
- Search for training/explanatory materials on provisions of Public Law 94-142.
- Search for good models of sound teacher-education programs: What does a good preparation program look like?
- Search for models of good or exemplary practices. When a school is considered to have good practices for the education of handicapped-all-children, what does it look like?

2. AWARENESS II (Awareness of dimensions of the challenge and that DGPs are in the business of organizational change):

Increasing awareness that an effective project/program requires attention to all dimensions of the teacher-education program; isolated adjustments do not suffice.

Increasing awareness that the Dean's Grant is not just another grant but requires encompassing institutional commitments.

Increasing awareness of the need for strong leadership from the dean and administrative offices.

Search for needs assessments/evaluation instruments:
Attitude inventories.
Faculty awareness of provisions of Public Law 94-142.
Assessments of skills and knowledge needed for successful teachers.
Assessments for address to comprehensive training programs.
Community/field-based assessments of teacher competencies.

Search for teacher competencies (across all disciplines). Establishment of countless lists of competencies.

Awareness and acknowledgement that DGPs are involved in problems of pervasive organizational change.

References to change literature and processes.

Reassessments of scope of change to be undertaken: recalculations of commitments of deans and institutions to actual change, and of the nature of issues involved.

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Change literature in higher education.
- Models of exemplary teacher-education pre-service programs.
- Available lists of teacher competencies.

- Needs assessments/evaluation instruments.
- Consultants on innovations and adoptions.
- Inventories: attitudes, knowledge, skills, change.

3. DIVERSION FROM THE TASK (Reconsideration of commitment):

Aggressive press of federal offices on need for documentation and evaluation of the work and impact of DGPs on curriculum. In programs in very early stages of operation, evaluation was preoccupied with the process rather than substance of change.

Aggressive press for involvement of all communities: higher education, parents, state department personnel, schools, related agencies, and professional disciplines.

Increasing attention to DGPs as a vehicle for change. Beginning of Outreach by the projects to other institutions. Recognition that DGP models presented good prospects for accommodating and institutionalizing change.

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Evaluation instruments of all kinds.
- Program evaluation models.
- Project address to issues of documentation and outreach: What kind, how much, for whom, and for what purpose?
- Federally recommended models for reporting evaluation and change efforts.
- Dissemination vehicles for project products: recognition that projects need to extend beyond their borders.
- Address to export of change efforts.

4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT:

Explosion in faculty-development activities with emergence of the following:

Faculty retreats: entire departments, units, colleges.

Faculty seminars: bag lunches, formal and informal seminars.

Development of faculty-authored reports: collection of papers on various aspects of handicapping conditions and educational address thereof.

Strategies for development/involvement of faculty members in work of the DGPs: incentives for faculty members to visit school settings; shadowing of handicapped children; commission of authored papers.

Development of resource units on handicapped children, prepared for use by faculty members.

Creation of faculty resource centers on handicapped literature.

Development of instructional aids for use by faculty members.

Development of team-taught courses: faculty assistance in teaching sections of courses.

Overtures of regular educators to special educators and vice versa.

Extended participation/delegation of conference atten-

dance to more members of faculties. DGP personnel no longer are the sole participants in regional and national conferences; other faculty members also are engaged.

Emergence of interinstitutional seminars conducted for and by faculty members.

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Resources/speakers for faculty retreats.
- Technical assistance for publication of faculty-sponsored reports.
- Technical assistance for participation in regional and national conferences.
- Information on successful strategies for faculty involvement.
- Information on faculty members in other institutions engaged in like efforts (e.g., secondary efforts, methods personnel, science educators, administrators, counselors, foundations specialists, etc.).
- Dissemination assists for faculty-authored monographs and reports.

5. CURRICULUM CHANGE:

Attention to issues of curriculum change. Emphasis on elementary levels, overtures to secondary levels; flirtations with counseling, administration, foundations, art, music, etc.

Attention to programmatic needs assessments.

Attention to identification of needed curricular content relating to handicapped children and coverage in host institution programs. Designs of matrices of goals, courses, faculty members.

Establishment of resource centers to support not only faculty development but program resources also.

Organized development of modules to address curriculum content not currently represented in regular instructional sequences.

Development of new courses.

Development of new resource units.

Faculty consideration given to teacher-education sequences, effective curriculum offerings, and delivery thereof.

Consideration given to improved methods courses, student-teaching placements and supervision, relations with schools.

Syllabi revisions; development of reference lists and curriculum guides. Work with formal curriculum committees.

Appearance of descriptions of program change among the DGPs.

Development of "Common Body of Practice for Teachers: the Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education."

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Lists of training systems and materials.

- Instructional modules on all aspects of addressing educational needs of handicapped children.
- Development and expansion of resource centers; search for supporting documentation and available literature.
- Design and formats of instructional/program matrices.
- Revised course outlines and syllabi.
- Documentation of change in curriculum of other teacher-education sequences and programs.

6. OUTREACH EFFORTS:

Increase in interuniversity seminars for faculty members. Seminars on both selected institutional and state-wide bases.

Aggressive outreach to other in-state institutions. Assistance of AACTE in promoting interinstitutional and state-wide cooperation.

Aggressive outreach to state departments, professional organizations, community.

Increased DGP participation in professional conferences of state and national scope.

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Information on consortium models.
- Information on and access to national and regional conference programs and agendae.
- Search for materials to be provided to state-wide institutional conferences.
- Search for speakers, participants, consultants for outreach activities.

7. DOCUMENTATION AND DISSEMINATION:

Increase in quality and degree of documentation of change efforts in DGPs.

Research studies undertaken on aspects of DGPs.

Efforts to write journal articles documenting change efforts. Emphasis on both substantive and procedural changes.

Production and distribution of project reports. Dissemination efforts made by individual projects with or without assistance from technical assistance agencies.

Materials/Resources Needed/Sought:

- Assistance in duplicating and mailing.
- Requests for mailing lists. Recommendations for conference participants.
- Exchanges across professional fields.

The preceding outline reports in somewhat simplistic terms the major dimensions of the work of DGPs. Projects spend differing amounts of time and energies at each level or stage. In each instance, there is a search for precedents, models, and available resources. For most of these enterprises, "cookbook" materials simply do not exist. At all stages, there is evidence of reliance on the collective history of DGPs: "Take what we did and try it. Call me and let me know how it goes."

The network aspect of DGP activities consistently has been underplayed, but the loose configuration of a national program and regional supports in communication and technical assistance should not be overlooked by students of the DGPs. The posture that "we're all in this together" has served DGPs well. Instead of feelings of project isolation, the network notion has fostered a strong sense of community, energy, colleagueship, and motivation for project staff and their directors/deans. There can be little doubt that the regional and national meetings called by NSSP, AACTE, and other professional organizations, plus other project interactive efforts, have served a useful purpose. The maintenance of a national forum by the aggregate of more mature projects, those just beginning, and institutions considering application for admission to the Dean's Grant program has encouraged and enabled the sharing of information on strategies, materials, personnel, styles, and substance which has been extraordinarily useful even if difficult to adequately document. The newer DGPs have been enriched by the lessons of those who came before; the older projects have had pay-off in leadership positions in the public accounting of their efforts.

Materials and Resources Stemming from Role of National Support Systems Project

BECAUSE it is a technical assistance (support) system with activities that evolved over time, the role and functions of NSSP in relation to materials and resources never were clear. NSSP did not take upon itself, nor was it charged to undertake, the function of serving as a clearinghouse for mainstreaming materials; this misperception was held by DGPs and non-grant institutions alike. NSSP was characterized by both a proactive and supportive stance in stimulating, participating in the growth of, and disseminating information on major developments among the federal offices, DGPs, and related agencies. Its mission was to help interpret the contemporary context relating to increased opportunities for handicapped children in regular education programs; to articulate the vision, if you will: to hold the mirror for reflections; to encourage and stimulate the development, sharing, and adoption of best practices; and to support and nurture personnel and promising ideas wherever they were found.

Within this purpose, NSSP defined its role with respect to materials more specifically as follows:

- To reflect or provide orientation to the educational issues involved in the work of the DGPs to enhance the educational opportunities of children with handicaps.
- To help to create a literature on the integration of handicapped with nonhandicapped children in regular school programs.
- To create and sustain a forum for discussions and shared materials among DGPs.
- To duplicate and distribute, at low cost, especially useful materials and products.
- To support and encourage outreach activities by DGPs.

NSSP and Materials Production

Two dimensions define these activities: (a) materials production to contribute to the establishment of a literature in the field and (b) specific, targeted materials aimed at curriculum development in teacher education with supporting resources and documentation.

Literature. When NSSP (then the Leadership Training Institute) was actively engaged in the early 1970s in facilitating the integration of children with special needs into regular school programs, the available literature documenting successful teacher practices and outlining current problems was exceedingly limited. Since then there has been an exponential increase of materials and textbooks relating to the education of handicapped children. NSSP played a constructive role by providing leadership in building a literature on basic notions, teacher practices, and general issues in the accommodation of children with special needs. The leadership in documenting this movement was provided for more than a decade by Maynard Reynolds, director of the earlier Leadership Training Institute and the subsequent National Support Systems Project. Through contracts with authors, consultation on design and format of development, professional editing, and production and dissemination directly and through cooperative arrangements with standing professional organizations (CEC particularly; more recently, AACTE) in teacher education, NSSP produced a selective literature which is recognized as a contribution to the field. The materials so made available were those that were essential to the LTI and NSSP missions but did not promise sufficient returns to make them attractive to commercial publishers. The substantial additions to the informational and instructional literature serve perhaps, as an example for future technical assistance systems.

The nature of the NSSP production efforts can be classified as follows: materials for teachers and practitioners; (a) informative materials derived from academic disciplines; (b) materials examining contemporary issues; (c) materials relating to the work of the Dean's Grant Projects; and (d) resources not generally available elsewhere. The list of NSSP publications is appended to this chapter.

Curriculum Development. In 1978, when the Dean's Grant program had been underway for approximately three years, individual projects were instituting needed curriculum changes and were in process of discovering that their programs related not just to handicapped children but to all children; that the curriculum changes underway applied to the entire teacher-preparation sequence; that their work had ramifications for all faculties: special education, foundations, administration, and all school-related personnel as well as regular educators; that faculty members in instructional institutions were not always knowledgable about current issues in the education of handicapped children; that piecemeal changes were inadequate for the long range; and leverage was needed to grasp and provide leadership for curriculum change.

It also was apparent that a useful, comprehensive explication of strong teacher-education programs, assuming full curriculum integration of the principles of Public Law 94-142 with all their implications, simply did not exist in manageable form. Again under the leadership of Maynard Reynolds, the NSSP undertook to develop, in cooperation with the teacher-education community, a comprehensive structure that would at least set out for discussion one possible structure for a solid teacher-education program that would meet the needs of all children, including those with handicaps.

Thus began a three-year program of curriculum development under NSSP leadership. The first step was the document, A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law

94-142 to Teacher Education.[1] The second step was the development of teacher-education resource modules extending, or fleshing out, the domains of teacher competencies outlined in the basic document. The rationale for and documentation of these development efforts in curriculum are presented in the chapter by Lakin and Reynolds.

Characteristics of NSSP Development Efforts. For the record, the characteristics of materials development by NSSP were contracts with modest honoraria signed with authors; all materials are in the public domain with no royalties to developers, authors, or agencies; materials reproduced in expensive format; and broad dissemination at low cost or at cost. The NSSP placed materials, where possible, with standing professional organizations to encourage distribution. In fact, NSSP undertook to "give away" as many of its ideas and publications as was possible and practical, and to take all measures to strengthen and contribute to the professional community. To the Dean's Grant Projects, the primary clients of NSSP, complimentary copies of all materials were routinely provided and multiple copies were made available on an at-cost basis.

Materials and Resources Developed by Dean's Grant Projects

BECAUSE DGPs are not intended to give primary emphasis to materials development and NSSP is not directly in the business of acting as a clearinghouse for materials that are devised, it is not possible here to delineate the full extent of the products coming out of DGPs.

What has been developed?

The NSSP has assembled and annotated an inventory of materials received in its offices over the last several years. This inventory has a highly limited shelf-life but while the supply lasts it is available from the University of Minnesota.[2] The following index shows the categories of materials which have been produced by DGPs (the categories are arbitrary); the listing is not comprehensive.

Index: DGP Products

Awareness Activities: For Faculty Members and Students
- Provisions and intent of Public Law 94-142
- Program assessments and needs for change
- Problems/issues of handicapped children
- Roles of IHEs in relation to legal and social mandates
- Movements in teacher-education institutions

Attitudes: Of Faculty Members and Students
- Toward handicapped persons
- Toward change processes
- Toward "mainstreaming"
- Toward changes needed to implement Public Law 94-142
- Toward needs for adjusted or revised curriculum
- Toward interests and needs of parents

[1] See publications list.

[2] Requests should be directed to NSSP Publications, Department of Educational Psychology, Burton Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Materials Relating to Provisions of Public Law 94-142 and Related Contextual Issues

Bibliographies/Resources:
- Bibliographies on mainstreaming
- Bibliographies on change processes
- Bibliographies on all aspects of handicapping conditions
- Media lists (filmstrips, films, video tapes)
- College resources
- Community resources
- Resources available for handicapped college students

Change Literature: Processes/Procedures
- Bibliographies
- Planning documents
- Implementation procedures
- Institutionalization of
- Evaluation
- Follow-up materials

Faculty Development
- Strategies for faculty development
- Resource units on handicapping conditions
- Readings
- Self-instructional packets
- Seminars/Workshops/Retreats
- Support systems for faculty development
- Interinstitutional seminars
- Instructional materials: Modules
- Instructional materials; resource listings; curriculum guides

Curriculum
- Analysis: Program review instruments (by course/program)
- Instructional delivery matrices
- Teacher competency lists for work with handicapped children
- Integration/assessment of skills and knowledge
- Course outlines
- Course syllabi
- Curriculum overview

Instruction
- On substance of Public Law 94-142
- Characteristics and learning styles of handicapped children
- New course outlines
- Aspects of instruction: e.g., modules on class management; behavior management; learning styles; assessment; grading, adaptation of instruction.
- Materials for related disciplines

Topics: Foundations
Counselors
Art
Science
Music
Administration
Health, Recreation, Physical Education
Secondary Education
Elementary Education

Materials Relating to Work with Parents

Student Teaching: Placements and Supervision

Graduate Performance Evaluations

Evaluation and Instruments:
- Course
- Program
- Attitudes
- Knowledge Base: Faculty and Students
- Methods Courses
- Placements and Supervision
- Grant Implementation
- Curriculum

Final Project Reports

Newsletters

Interuniversity Seminars and Visits

Task Force Reports

Special Study Reports

Outreach Activities:
- Publications
- Papers on DGPs
- Conference presentations and seminars
- Outreach to related professional disciplines
- State and national ACTE meetings and conferences

Are there common characteristics in the development of materials? Each DGP seems to follow a similar evolutionary pattern: awareness/orientation to the problem; confronting the fact that achievement of DGP goals requires pervasive change: early efforts to achieve changes in a "quick and dirty" fashion; and the sober realization that change is a time-consuming process necessitating the active participation of faculty members and affecting the total instructional program. At the same time, the existence of few precedents for the standard accomplishment of changes is acknowledged, as in the fact that the best available resources probably are specific to the project, the institution, and the area.

Observations on common characteristics of development efforts are not of earth-shattering import but may be of interest:

- Among early DGPs, there rarely was a comprehensive, planful approach to identification of materials needs. Increasingly, projects are more systematic as the terrain and task become more familiar and better documented.
- Personnel in charge of grant activities are responsible for providing immediate responses for needed materials. Materials are produced for local use, to meet local needs and contingencies.
- Technicians rarely are involved in developmental efforts; curriculum specialists may or may not be involved in curriculum-change efforts.
- The key to the use of materials is involvement by users in planning and development.
- Materials development is a useful strategy to involve faculty members in DGPs.
- Low-budget materials can be as effective as more sophisticated presentations.
- External dissemination is not generally part of the planning in developmental efforts.

- Materials vary in ability to "stand alone," without interpretations.
- Developers are unusually willing to share ideas and efforts, if the incompleteness of the production is understood and accepted.
- Sharing comes about through encouragement to do so; regional and national meetings provide helpful if protected climates for airing new ideas. Developers generally are shy or reserved about the relevance of their work.

Are materials exportable?

Few products may be directly and entirely transferable to other locations but their ideas generally are. Situations/climates differ among DGPs, so needed product modifications are obvious; skilled educators readily can make appropriate adjustments. Developers are surprisingly and gratifyingly willing to share materials for use "as is" or with revisions, as long as acknowledgements are made. The climate is favorable to the sharing of ideas, materials, and personnel across training programs and institutions; this situation has not always existed among pre-service preparation programs.

Are some materials particularly helpful?

Without question, some ideas and products are more relevant and applicable to the task of DGPs than others. But, according to whom? Materials useful in one setting may not be so in another; products which one reviewer might reject for solid reasons can be highly appropriate under another set of circumstances in another setting. The suggestion that some products are more useful than others does an injustice to many of the products unknown to the NSSP at this juncture; not to make an attempt to compile such a list is an injustice of another order. If the NSSP were to develop a "short list" of institutions that have created particularly constructive and useful-looking materials (depending on obvious questions of setting and application) it would include the following:

Augustana College (awareness activities; curriculum revisions)
Central Florida University (documentation of program change)
Cleveland State University (assessments of faculty knowledge and skills; materials for counselors and administrators)
Colorado State University (comprehensive planning and change: secondary level)
Consortium Universities
Howard University (documentation for disabled students)
Hunter College (faculty development strategies)
Memphis State University (documentation of program change; interinstitutional relationships)
North Carolina State University (faculty development strategies)
Ohio State University (instructional materials)
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (resource identification; documentation)
University of Illinois (curriculum guides; curriculum revisions)
University of Kansas (program revision planning; instructional modules; evaluation)
University of Kentucky (faculty publications/papers; DGP documentation)

University of Michigan (instructional modules)
University of Missouri/Columbia (interuniversity seminars; evaluation documentation)
University of Nebraska (project documentation for student performance; program descriptions and content; outreach)
University of Northern Colorado (resource materials)
University of Northern Illinois (curriculum revisions: elementary level)
University of Oregon (planning and documentation)
University of the Pacific (comprehensive planning)
University of Portland (identification of teacher competencies)
University of Texas at Austin (PROJECT PREM - resource materials)
University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee (resource materials)
Virginia Commonwealth University (planning and evaluation; curriculum development)
Western Oregon University (program and student performance evaluations)
West Virginia University (documentation of program change)

What happens to products developed by DGPs?

No mechanism for the screening or sharing of DGP products was established by the federal agency, projects, or NSSP to continue the early, if superficial, efforts of NSSP to alert personnel to DGP-developed resources. It is not that such a distribution center could not be established to serve a set of projects but, simply, that such a mechanism has not been established to date. Recently, there has been a movement to deposit DGP-developed products with the ERIC system. Materials then could be abstracted and reproduced on request, and would continue to be available after the project has terminated. The ERIC system is willing to assume this function and even has made provision to cross-reference such materials in both the Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children.

Obtaining hard copies of often-fugitive materials requires some persistence. Project personnel are unusually accommodating in meeting requests and inquiries, although their response systems overload quickly. In general, materials may be available through one of six possible channels: (a) the project directly, while dissemination monies and staff time permit; (b) possible dissemination systems developed by the host institution; (c) ERIC; (d) state or national conference reproduction of materials; (e) commercial publishers or LINC; (f) or some kind of ad hoc organization, such as the NSSP. Currently, no central listing indicates existing materials or their outlets, other than the partial inventory of the NSSP.

Although the NSSP capacity to respond to requests for materials was somewhat limited, it was possible to work through the structure to obtain copies of selected DGP-developed materials. NSSP offered various means of dissemination assistance: direct duplication for complimentary distribution to DGPs; direct duplication by NSSP for low-cost sales to DGPs and other members of the teacher-education community; supporting duplication and direct mailings by developing institutions; partial supports for reproduction by developing institutions; and recommendations and assists in procuring duplication and distribution of products by outside agencies. The NSSP also reproduced materials in quantity for periodic mailings to DGPs, for use at regional or national meetings, or for distribution at other professional meetings. The NSSP was able also to duplicate individual copies on specific request.

The obstacles to the effective dissemination of DGP-developed products reflect the general dissemination troubles of federal initiatives and teacher-education practices. One can only hope that the leadership in the community will chip away at the obstacles and ease the sharing of ideas and practices. Of course, the actual problem underlying the confusion on accessibility and availability of materials very well may be the following: To what extent does the task of integrating handicapped children into regular education programs require a fundamental, new literature and new curriculum materials? It is possible that sufficient resources already exist and that the problems may be not those of insufficient knowledge but, rather, of effective delivery and the sustained application of skills and knowledge already produced.

Dissemination: Disposition of Current Materials

IN terminating NSSP activities, the concern for providing for continued accessibility to materials was paramount. As it turns out, long-range accessibility cannot be assured but the short-term provisions appear satisfactory.

The NSSP and the Dean's Grant Projects have enjoyed the support and cooperation of the standing professional structures, particularly, The Council for Exceptional Children and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. These organizations are concerned with and have shared the discussions on dissemination of DGP materials. They have a genuine interest in seeing that products and materials are made available on a low-cost, broad range basis to educators across the country. The dissemination of products through those structures - and announcement of existence of the materials - has enabled a far more effective sharing of information than most ad hoc structures, such as the NSSP, can manage; the DGPs and NSSP owe their appreciation to the personnel of those agencies for their years of continued interest and support.

The disposition of current materials is addressed in the following order:

- NSSP-developed materials: Literature and Curriculum Development Materials
- DGP-developed materials.

1. NSSP-Developed Materials

The agencies from which current materials can be obtained are listed in the Appendix to this chapter along with the titles that are available. These agencies are AACTE, The Council for Exceptional Children, and the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Minnesota.

All NSSP-developed materials also are entered into the ERIC system.

2. Dean's Grant Projects Products

The summary or partial inventory of DGP-developed materials to date (Fall 1982) is available from the University of Minnesota while the supply lasts and the shelf-life of the inventory is acceptable. This same inventory has been forwarded to the ERIC system, with intentions of making as many of the items as possible available through their distribution channels. Future DGPs will be encouraged to forward one copy of each item developed to ERIC for distribution in the same manner. Materials not available through ERIC or commercial systems may be requested from the individual

projects and are subject to individual project response capacity.

Personnel Resources

THIS review would be incomplete without reference to the personnel resources in the Dean's Grant Projects. The unsung heroes of the grants are the deans, staff persons actively engaged in project direction, and faculty members in the host institutions across the country who are working to put into place revised practices and structures to accommodate mildly handicapped children in least restrictive settings. In all DGPs there are extraordinarily committed, informed, and effective artist/educators, with skills and expertise in all manner of topics that are relevant to the work of the projects. These people are the real sources and forces of changed curriculum and teacher-education practices.

Publications List

Unless stated otherwise the materials are available from: Department of Educational Psychology, Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive S.E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

* Available from The Council for Exceptional Children

\+ Available from American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

1. Bates, P. (Ed.). Mainstreaming: Our current knowledge base. (1981)
2. *Birch, J. W. Mainstreaming: Educable mentally retarded children in regular classes. (1974)
3. *Birch, J. W. Hearing impaired pupils in the mainstream. (1976)
4. Davis, J. (Ed.). Our forgotten children: Hard-of-hearing pupils in the schools. (1977)
5. *Deno, E. N. Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. (1972)
6. Deno, E. N. Educating children with emotional, learning and behavior problems. (1978)
7. *Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Data-based program modification: A manual. (1977)
8. *Freeman, G. G. Speech and language services and the classroom teacher. (1977)
9. *Grosenick, J. K., & Reynolds, M. C. (Eds.). Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. (1978)
10. *Hively, W., & Reynolds, M. C. (Eds.). Domain-referenced testing in special education. (1975)
11. Jones, R. A. (Ed.). Mainstreaming and the minority child. (1976)
12. Jones, R. A. (Ed.). Special education in transition: Attitudes toward handicapped children. (1982) (Part I)
13. Jones, R. A. (Ed.). Reflections on growing up disabled. (1982) (Part II)
14. *Martin, G. J., & Hoben, M. C. (Eds.). Supporting visually impaired students in the mainstream. (1977)
15. *Parker, C. A. (Ed.). Psychological consultation: Helping teachers meet special needs. (1975)
16. Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Psychology in the schools: Proceedings of the conference on psychology and the process of schooling in the next decade. (1971)
17. Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Special education and school system decentralization. (1975)
18. *Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. (1976)

19. Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). National technical assistance systems in special education: Report of the conference in Washington, DC. (1976)

20. *Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Futures of education for exceptional students: Emerging structures. (1978)

21. +Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Foundations of teacher preparation: Responses to Public Law 94-142. (1982)

22. *Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). The future of mainstreaming: Next steps in teacher education. (1982)

23. +Reynolds, M. C., Birch, J. W., Grohs, D., Howsam, R., & Morsink, C. A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of PL 94-142 to teacher education. (1980)

24. Reynolds, M. C., & Brandl, J. (Eds.). Public policy and educating handicapped persons. (1982)

25. Reynolds, M. C., & Davis, M. (Eds.). Exceptional children in regular classrooms. (1971)

26. *Ross, M., & Nober, L. W. (Eds.). Special education in transition: Educating hard of hearing children. (1981)

27. +Sharp, B. I. (Ed.). Dean's Grant Projects: Challenge and change in teacher education. (1982)

28. +Sivage, C. R., Bryson, J. M., & Okun, K. A. Politics, power, and personality: The roles of deans in Dean's Grant Projects. (1982)

29. Spicker, H. H., Anastasiow, N. J., & Hodges, W. L. (Eds.). Children with special needs: Early development and education. (1976)

30. Stevens, L. (Ed.). Mainstreaming training systems, materials and resources: A working list (5th ed.). (1981)

31. *Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D. S., & Semmel, M. I. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. (1974)

32. *Weinberg, R. A., & Wood, F. H. Observation of pupils and teachers in mainstream and special education settings: Alternative strategies. (1975)

Reports of the Dean's Grant Projects Series

33. #1 Dean's Grant Products (INTERIM REPORT #2). 1982 (No longer available)

34. #2 Secondary Education of the Handicapped: Conference Proceedings 1980. Colorado State University. Marilyn F. Fender, Editor.

35. #3 Toward a Research Base for the Least Restrictive Environment: A Collection of Papers. University of Kentucky, Dean's Grant Project. January 1981.

36. #4 Selected Bibliographies: Dean's Grant Projects. 1981.

37. #5 Program Report. Preparing Classroom Teachers to Work with mainstreamed handicapped children. A University's Approach to Integration of Curriculum at the Undergraduate Level. University of Nebraska/Lincoln, Dean's Grant Project, April 1981.

38. #6 Incidental Paper. Mainstreaming: Implications for Reconceptualizing Schooling. Mara Sapon-Shevin, Cleveland State University, Dean's Grant Project, April 1981.

39. #7 Bibliography of Special Education Materials. Dean's Grant Project, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, 1980.

Dean's Grant Projects Materials

40. Brochure of the Dean's Grant Projects

41. Directory and Abstracts for Dean's Grant Projects

42. The Dean's Grant Projects: A Descriptive Analysis and Evaluation 1980.

Teacher Education Modules
(For titles of individual modules see Lakin and Reynolds, this volume.)

Research/Evaluation Programs

43. Bryson, J. M. A Contingent Program Planning Model for Changing Teacher Preparation in Response to P.L. 94-142.

44. Bryson, J. M. A Contingent Formative Evaluation Model for Evaluating Changes in Teacher Preparation in Response to P.L. 94-142.

45. Bryson, J. M. A Contingent Summative Evaluation Model for Evaluating Changes in Teacher Preparation in Response to P.L. 94-142.